DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 473 CE 075 404

AUTHOR	Wentling, Rose Mary; Palma-Rivas, Nilda
TITLE	Diversity in the Workforce: A Literature Review. Diversity in the Workforce Series Report #1.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1997-12-00
NOTE	114p.; For related documents, see CE 075 405-406.
CONTRACT	V051A30004-97A; V051A30003-97A
AVAILABLE FROM	NCRVE Materials Distribution Service, Horrabin Hall 46, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455; phone: 800-637-7652 (order no. MDS-934, $10).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Attitude Change; Change Strategies; *Cultural Pluralism; *Diversity (Institutional); Employee Attitudes; Employer Attitudes; *Employment Practices; *Labor Force; Literature Reviews; On the Job Training; Organizational Change; *Organizational Climate; Personnel Management; Vocational Education; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS	*Diversity Training

ABSTRACT

The literature on diversity in the work force was reviewed to determine the complexity and breadth of workplace diversity issue and identify trends in diversity management and training. The literature review focused on the following: definition of diversity; changing society and work force; reasons organizations are managing and valuing diversity; barriers to managing diversity; diversity training; and future trends. Although many different definitions of diversity were found, none fully included all the characteristics that a diverse population may bring to the workplace. It was concluded that, because the U.S. demographic composition is affecting the makeup of both the labor force and the marketplace, having a diverse work force and managing it properly are increasingly being perceived as competitive strategies that can attract both diverse customers and employees who have different perspectives, enhancing the organization's creativity. Corporate productivity and profitability have been deemed important reasons for implementing diversity initiatives, including diversity training. Needs assessment and evaluation and the qualifications of diversity trainers were identified as essential elements in the process of developing diversity training programs. (The document contains an annotated bibliography of 32 video resources and a list of 210 references.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 414 473

NCRVE

National Center for Research in Vocational Education

University of California, Berkeley

DIVERSITY IN THE WORKFORCE: A LITERATURE REVIEW

DIVERSITY IN THE WORKFORCE SERIES REPORT #1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Supported by
the Office of Vocational and Adult Education,
U.S. Department of Education

CE075404

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This publication is available from the:

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Materials Distribution Service
Western Illinois University
46 Horrabin Hall
Macomb, IL 61455

800-637-7652 (Toll Free)

DIVERSITY IN THE WORKFORCE SERIES
REPORT #1:
DIVERSITY IN THE WORKFORCE: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Rose Mary Wentling
Nilda Palma-Rivas

University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign

National Center for Research in Vocational Education
University of California at Berkeley
2030 Addison Street, Suite 500
Berkeley, CA 94720-1674

Supported by
The Office of Vocational and Adult Education
U.S. Department of Education

December 1997 MDS-934

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Grant Number:	V051A30003-97A/V051A30004-97A
Act under which Funds Administered:	Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act P.L. 98-524
Source of Grant:	Office of Vocational and Adult Education U.S. Department of Education Washington, DC 20202
Grantee:	The Regents of the University of California c/o National Center for Research in Vocational Education 2030 Addison Street, Suite 500 Berkeley, CA 94720-1674
Director:	David Stern
Percent of Total Grant Financed by Federal Money:	100%
Dollar Amount of Federal Funds for Grant:	$4,500,000
Disclaimer:	This publication was prepared pursuant to a grant with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Department of Education position or policy.
Discrimination:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

Related Readings from NCRVE

for **Diversity in the Workplace: A Literature Review** (MDS-934)

by Rose Mary Wentling and Nilda Palma-Rivas

Voices of Diversity in Programs Linking Education and Work *Briefs*

What do students think about the new programs that link education and work? What kind of learning do they get in these programs? How does gender influence their perspectives? This series of briefs highlights findings derived from a national study of students enrolled in programs structured by current education reform ideas. Of particular interest were the perspectives of students who are traditionally underrepresented—female, Latino, and Asian. Practitioners, educators, policymakers, and researchers will gain a better understanding of students' high school and two-year college experiences from these briefs.
By V. Hernández-Gantes.
931a: Learning from Students' Perspectives on Programs Linking Education and Work
931b: Quality Indicators of Programs Linking Education and Work
931c: Building a School Climate Conducive to Learning: Students' Perspectives
931d: Grounding Career Development in Authentic Learning Activities
931e: Connecting Education and Work Through Authentic Instruction
931f: Gender Perspectives on Programs Linking Education and Work
MDS-931/July 1997/$3.00 each

Current Status of Diversity Initiatives in Selected Multinational Corporations

The purpose of this study was to provide information on the status of the diversity process in U.S.-based multinational corporations that are committed to addressing diversity in the workplace. Eight diversity managers/directors at multinational corporations in Illinois were asked to provide information on their diversity initiatives; the planning, implementation and evaluation of the initiatives; factors assisting in their success; barriers; and future plans. The study revealed that an evolutionary pattern exists for diversity initiatives that has evolved from Affirmative Action to international diversity. Multinational corporations have a high degree of sophistication in their diversity initiatives, are doing much more than required by law, and it appears that these initiatives will continue to become even more important.
By R. M. Wentling, N. Palma-Rivas.
MDS-936/December 1997/$12.00

Current Status and Future Trends of Diversity Initiatives in the Workplace: Diversity Experts' Perspectives

This report presents the results of a study on the current status and future trends of diversity initiatives in the workplace. The major method of this research study was in-depth, open-ended telephone interviews with a panel of 12 diversity experts who were located throughout the United States. This study revealed the barriers that have inhibited the employment, development, retention, and promotion of diverse groups in the workplace, and the major factors that are influencing diversity initiatives in the workplace. Presented also are the best strategies for managing diversity. Components of an effective diversity training program, and the future trends related to diversity are discussed.
By R. M. Wentling, N. Palma-Rivas.
MDS-1082/November 1997/$6.50

☞ Call **800/637-7652** to order.
Check out NCRVE's complete Products Catalog at http://ncrve.berkeley.edu

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of Mildred Griggs, Director of the University of Illinois NCRVE site and the many NCRVE staff members at the University of California at Berkeley for their continued support of this project.

In addition, special thanks are due to the anonymous reviewers selected by NCRVE for their valuable comments on earlier drafts.

PREFACE

This is the first report in the Diversity in the Workforce Series sponsored by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE). This series is intended to inform the readers of the dynamics and breadth of workforce diversity issues. In addition, it provides information to educators and people from business and industry. They can use this information to develop practices and guidelines to follow when selecting or assessing workplace environments that are conducive to maximizing the contributions of all workers.

The information on workforce diversity from this series may enable educators to revise their curricula appropriately to reflect changes in the workplace, identify workable strategies for accommodating and managing differences in the workplace, and illustrate for their students the continuing impact of diversity on the organizational culture and climate of corporations. The information may also assist human resource development professionals or any person in charge of programs dealing with diversity in organizations to better assess the needs of the employees; improve the design, implementation, and evaluation of diversity efforts; and identify initiatives to improve the management of a diverse workforce.

This report presents a summary of the workforce diversity issues and also reviews the key points from research studies, books, reports, journal articles, related magazines, and newspaper articles on diversity in the workforce.

Below is a listing of the four reports included in the Diversity in the Workforce Series:

1. *Report #1: Diversity in the Workforce: A Literature Review*
2. Report #2: Current Status and Future Trends of Diversity Initiatives in the Workplace: Diversity Experts' Perspective
3. Report #3: Current Status of Diversity Initiatives in Multinational Corporations
4. Report #4: The Role of Diversity Initiatives in the Successful Transition of Minority Youth into the Workplace

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main focus of this report is to describe in detail the literature on diversity in the workforce to bring about an understanding of the complexity and breadth of workplace diversity issues. The report also intends to provide insights on the trends that have emerged in the field of diversity, and information that can be used to develop new and unique approaches that fit the specific needs of particular organizations. To accomplish this, the authors summarized information on workforce diversity issues from research studies, books, reports, journal articles, related magazines, and newspaper articles on diversity in the workforce. The sources of information used in this review ranged in date from 1961 to 1997.

The literature reviewed was summarized and categorized under the following sections: Diversity Defined, The Changing Society and Workforce, Why Organizations Are Managing and Valuing Diversity, Barriers To Managing Diversity, Strategies for Managing Diversity, Diversity Training, and Future Trends. In addition, readers are provided with useful information such as a glossary of diversity terms and a list of videos on the topic.

The literature review also showed that although there are numerous ways in which diversity has been defined, there is no definition that fully includes all the characteristics that a diverse population may bring to the workplace. It also showed that there are many forces that are driving diversity issues in organizations. For example, there is a significant increase in women and minority populations in the workplace; Americans continue to mature; an increasing number of minority youths are becoming part of the workforce; gay men, lesbians, and bisexual individuals are becoming an important part of the workforce and marketplace; people with disabilities are also increasingly entering the labor force; and more business is becoming global.

This literature review indicates that the demographic composition is affecting not only the makeup of the labor workforce but also the makeup of the marketplace. Therefore, having a diverse workforce and managing it properly is perceived as a competitive strategy that can not only help attract diverse customers but also employees who have different perspectives that can contribute to the creativity of the organization. This review also indicated that researchers have found that an important reason for implementing diversity initiatives in organizations is to improve corporate productivity and profitability.

The literature review also showed that there is a wide range of approaches, strategies, or initiatives for managing diversity in the workplace. No single initiative is comprehensive enough to solve all diversity issues or to successfully manage diversity in organizations; however, diversity training is one of the primary and most widely used initiatives to address diversity issues. The information collected also revealed that diversity issues will continue because the population will become even more diverse and more companies will become global. As diversity is becoming more and more complex, diversity training will continue to be an essential element of the overall diversity strategy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments i
Preface iii
Executive Summary v
Introduction 1
Diversity Defined 3
The Changing Society and Workforce 4
Why Organizations Are Valuing and Managing Diversity 8
Barriers To Managing Diversity 19
- Stereotypes and Prejudice 19
- Discrimination 21
- Harassment 22
- Difficulty Balancing Work and Family 23
- Poor Career Planning and Development 24
- Lack of Organizational Political Savvy 24
- Unsupportive Work Environment 25
- Exclusion and Isolation 26
- Qualifications and Performance Questioned 27
- Lack of Mentors 27
- Backlash 28

Strategies for Managing Diversity 30
Diversity Training 37
- Benefits of Diversity Training 39
- Types of Diversity Training 40
- Conducting Needs Assessment 43
- Content of Training 48
- Selecting a Trainer 51
- Training Methods and Techniques 54
- Challenges and Obstacles of Diversity Training 56
- Characteristics of an Effective Diversity Training Program 60
- Evaluation of Diversity Training 63

Future Trends 68
Conclusions 70
Glossary 73

Resource List of Videos 79
References 85

INTRODUCTION

The changing workforce is one of the most extraordinary and significant challenges facing United States' organizations today. Our society is changing quickly and the demographic changes within the American workforce have the potential to affect many aspects of organizational management. By the year 2000, more than 90% of the new entrants into the workforce will be women and minorities (the words *minorities* and *people of color* will be used in this report interchangeably). Many of these workers will be immigrants, which may pose a communication challenge in the workplace. People from many different racial groups will be working together to keep businesses running competitively (Griggs, 1995). It is expected that the extent to which these demographic workforce shifts are effectively and efficiently managed will have an important impact on organizations' competitive and economic outcomes (Caudron, 1990; Johnston & Packer, 1987). Organizations that recognize that they need to fully develop all members of their workforce to remain competitive are responding by implementing a variety of different approaches to managing diversity (Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991).

The main focus of this report is to describe in detail the literature on diversity in the workforce to bring about an understanding of the complexity and breadth of workplace diversity issues. The report also intends to provide insights on the trends that have emerged in the field of diversity, and information that can be used to develop new and unique approaches that fit the specific needs of particular organizations. To accomplish this, the authors will present a summary of the workforce diversity issues and also review the key points from research studies, books, reports, and journal articles written for business and human resource professionals, and related magazines and newspaper articles on diversity in the workforce. The sources of information used in this review range in date from 1961 to 1997. This literature review also attempts to expose the reader to the current writings on diversity in the workforce to provide a knowledge base in the area of workforce diversity. A basic understanding of previous research is required not only to develop further studies to expand the knowledge base for diversity in the workforce, but also to advance human resource practices related to diversity in the U.S. organizations. Cox (1990) stated that the knowledge base for diversity issues is appallingly limited. Similarly, Armitage (1993) stated that organizations are scrambling to develop diversity programs but there is little concrete guidance.

The information provided in this report can be used by leaders and decisionmakers to strengthen and support diversity efforts. The information can be of value to several different audiences. First, decisionmakers, such as human resource managers, training and development specialists, and line managers can learn or develop an awareness of what diversity is, its benefits, and how it is affecting the workplace. Second, educators can learn about the differences in organizational responses to diversity. The information on workforce diversity can help educators revise their curricula and illustrate to their students the impact of diversity in the workplace. Third, students interested in diversity in the workforce can use the information provided in this report to become more knowledgeable about the topic and to identify needed research related to diversity in the workforce. Essentially, the information provided here can be of value to anybody who has an interest in the area of diversity in the workforce.

One of the important factors in understanding diversity is how the changes in society are affecting the workforce. Therefore, a whole section is devoted to this topic in the report. The report also presents a variety of perspectives different authors have regarding the reasons organizations have for managing and valuing diversity. To develop an awareness of the difficulties of managing diversity, an analysis of the barriers to managing diversity is also presented. To address different viewpoints, many writings were analyzed in this discussion. A variety of strategies for managing diversity are also presented. However, special emphasis was placed on diversity training and its components because it is one of the primary and most widely used initiatives to address diversity issues in organizations (Baytos, 1995; Carnevale & Stone, 1995; Tomervik, 1995; Wheeler, 1994). In the diversity training section, the following areas are addressed: benefits of diversity, types of diversity training, needs assessment, content, selecting a trainer, training methods and techniques, challenges and obstacles of diversity training, characteristics of an effective diversity training program, and evaluation.

DIVERSITY DEFINED

There are numerous ways in which diversity has been defined. Narrow definitions tend to reflect Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) law, and define diversity in terms of race, gender, ethnicity, age, national origin, religion, and disability (Wheeler, 1994). Broad definitions may include sexual/affectional orientation, values, personality characteristics, education, language, physical appearance, marital status, lifestyle, beliefs, and background characteristics such as geographic origin, tenure with the organization, and economic status (Carr, 1993; Caudron, 1992; Thomas, 1992; Triandis, 1994). Hayles (1996), for instance, defines diversity as "All the ways in which we differ" (p. 105). He adds that the diversity concept is not limited to what people traditionally think of it as: race, gender, and disabilities (American Society for Training and Development [ASTD], 1996b).

Morrison (1992) categorized diversity in terms of four levels: (1) diversity as racial/ethnic/sexual balance, (2) diversity as understanding other cultures, (3) diversity as culturally divergent values, and (4) diversity as broadly inclusive (cultural, subcultural, and individual). Griggs (1995) classified diversity into primary and secondary dimensions. Primary dimensions of diversity are those human differences that are inborn and/or that exert an important impact on our early socialization and have an ongoing impact throughout our lives. The six primary dimensions include (1) age, (2) ethnicity, (3) gender, (4) physical abilities/qualities, (5) race, and (6) sexual/affectional orientation. Griggs also concluded that human beings cannot change these primary dimensions. They shape our basic self-image and have great influence on how we view the world. The secondary dimensions of diversity are those that can be changed and include, but are not limited to, educational background, geographic location, income, marital status, military experience, parental status, religious beliefs, and work experience.

Based on her workforce diversity research, Tomervik (1995) identified the following four basic themes related to the definition of diversity: (1) the diversity concept includes a broad range of differences in the workforce, including age, disability, education levels, ethnicity, family structure, function, geographic location, race, religion, sexual orientation, style, and values—definitions are extremely broad and all-inclusive; (2) the meaningful aspects of diversity are how it affects the individual and the organization; (3) the broadened definition of diversity requires a culture change within organizations such as

in management styles, human resource systems, philosophies, and approaches; and (4) there is an emphasis on communicating a concept of diversity as more than race, gender, Affirmative Action, and equal employment opportunity (p. 11-3). There is no one definitive definition that fully describes the broad range of differences diversity includes, the evolutionary nature of the process it represents, and the far-reaching impact it has on individuals and corporations (Tomervik, 1995).

This report focuses on diversity in the broadest sense, which includes all the different characteristics that make one individual different from another. The major purpose for defining diversity so broadly is that it is all-inclusive and recognizes everyone as part of the diversity that should be valued (Griggs, 1995). A broad definition of diversity goes beyond protected-class differences because all employees bring their differences, including a variety of group-identity differences, to the workplace (Johnson, 1995). A broad definition moves workplace diversity issues beyond an "us versus them" struggle to focus on using and maximizing diversity to accomplish both individual and organizational goals. It provides an overarching goal for a unifying focus.

THE CHANGING SOCIETY AND WORKFORCE

Most U.S. companies and institutions were originally patterned by the values and experiences of western European white men. These individuals were the ones who established the American organizational cultures. These white males built cultures that mirrored their own values and experiences and that supported their goals and priorities. During this early era, most women did not work outside the home and minority roles were very limited in the workplace. Although diversity did exist, those individuals who were different were expected to assimilate into the existing white male culture (Dickson, 1992; Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Thomas, 1990). Even though individuals who are different from white males now constitute the great majority of society, and the American workforce, they continue to be perceived as being outside the cultural norm in many organizations. This has resulted in limited career opportunities and low expectations for most diverse populations (Dunnette & Motowidlo, 1982; Loden & Rosener, 1991).

In the near future, the labor market will become more and more a seller's market. The shrinking of the workforce and the shortage of appropriate skilled labor will force employers to compete to attract, retain, and effectively manage all available employees (Finney, 1989; Jackson & Alvarez, 1992; Johnston & Packer, 1987; Morrison, 1992). Many organizations are changing their cultures and beginning to apply more emphasis to valuing and managing diversity mainly because they have a greater understanding of the significant role that diversity will play in their future competitive and organizational success (Finney, 1989; Griggs, 1995; S. Jackson, 1991; O'Hare, 1993).

The demographic composition of our society and the workforce has changed considerably and is expected to continue undergoing dramatic changes in the near future (Bolick & Nestleroth, 1988; Johnston & Packer, 1987). Loden and Rosener (1991) conclude that the demographic change will be away from the European-American male and more towards an increasingly diverse and segmented population. This population will include women and men of all races, ethnic backgrounds, ages, and lifestyles. It will include people of diverse sexual/affectional orientations, religious beliefs, and different physical abilities, who will need to work together effectively.

Others also agree that modern society is undergoing a historic transition from a predominately white society rooted in Western culture to a global society composed of diverse racial and ethnic minorities (O'Hare, 1993; Thomas, 1996; Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand, 1994). The U.S. Bureau of the Census (1994) predicts that by the 21st century today's racial and ethnic minorities who now comprise about 25% of the U.S. population will comprise nearly one-half of the population. In the next century, African Americans, Asians, and Latinos will outnumber whites in the U.S.

In addition, the rapid growth in the number of minorities has been marked by an increasing diversity in terms of language differences, cultural beliefs, and other practices within these population groups as new immigrant groups from the 1980s (e.g., Vietnamese, Cambodians, Dominicans, Nicaraguans) have joined earlier immigrant groups of Mexican Americans, Cuban Americans, Chinese Americans, and Japanese. Also, by 2010, Hispanics are expected to supplant African Americans as the nation's largest minority group. Hispanics have higher fertility than African Americans and Whites, more immigration, and the infant mortality rate of African Americans is twice that of Hispanics (O'Hare, 1993).

The demographic trends will most certainly affect the makeup of the U.S. labor force. Throughout the 1990s, people of color, white women, and immigrants will account for 85% of the net growth in our nation's labor force (Goldstein & Gilliam, 1990; Johnston & Packer, 1987; Offermann & Gowing, 1990). In 1980, women made up 43% of the total workforce. By the year 2000, they will account for more than 47%, and 61% of all American women will be employed. Also, in 1980, African Americans made up 10% of the total workforce and Hispanics accounted for 6%. By the end of the 1990s, African Americans will make up 12% of the total labor force, Hispanics will account for 10%, and Asians another 4% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1993).

The significant increase in minority populations also affects marketplace demands (Rossman, 1994). The Population Reference Bureau (Popular Reference Bureau Integrated, 1997) concludes that African Americans, Asians, and Latinos currently make up about 21% of the U.S. consumer base and they are expected to reach 25% by the year 2000. Pollar and González (1994) noted that organizations benefit from diversity by tapping into the tremendous purchasing power that minorities have. They provided two examples: (1) older Americans spend over $800 billion annually; and (2) minority markets buy more goods and services than any country that trades with the United States (p. 22). African Americans represent a potential spending power of $300 billion which would be ninth in the world (Rossman, 1994). To market products and serve a variety of diverse customers effectively, organizations will have to employ a diverse workforce (C. Jackson, 1991).

The American workforce will continue to mature, and there will be an increase in the racial and ethnic diversity within the elderly population as well (U.S. Department of Commerce & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1993). The average age of the workforce is expected to increase, from age 36 in 1986 to age 39 by the year 2000. The combination of changes in the age distribution of employees and new flatter organization structures mean that several generations of workers can find themselves working side by side (Jackson & Alvarez, 1992). Even if employees from these different generations were all white Americans, they would differ fundamentally in their values and attitudes about work (Elder, 1985), physical and mental functioning (Rhodes, 1983), as well as the everyday concerns that reflect their age group. There will also be increasing differences within each generation, gender, and cultural group.

An increasing number of youth in the 16- to 24-year-old group will be entering the job market by the end of the 1990s. These youths are likely to be more ethnically diverse than the workers in today's workforce (Finney, 1989; Johnston & Packer, 1987; Triandis & Bhawuk, 1994). According to Hamilton (1990), "The great challenge facing the nation is to prepare a changing population of young people to do new kinds of work. Failure imperils economic health, social progress, and democracy itself" (p. 1). As the U.S. economic conditions get better, the demands for workers will increase and employers will also have to turn increasingly to young people or otherwise suffer from a serious labor shortage.

Racial and linguistic biases continue to stifle employment opportunities for young minority youth. Schools have not fully developed, nor have workplaces fully utilized, the talents of minority youth (Hamilton, 1990; Triandis, 1976). Minority youths have a greater probability of being poor, living in poverty, or otherwise being disadvantaged. An increasing number of young people are diverging from the white middle-class pattern. Educational institutions and workplaces must adapt to changes in the youth population. Education and workplace training that are typically effective with advantaged youth will not necessarily enable disadvantaged youth to reach their full potential (Bloomfield, 1989; Hamilton, 1990; Ihlanfeldt & Sjoquist, 1993).

Gay men, lesbians, and bisexual individuals are also defined as new minorities in the workplace (Carnevale & Stone, 1995). Even though a lesbian and gay civil rights movement in the United States emerged in the 1950s, members of these groups are still rejected, and sometimes even more so than other minorities (Rogers, 1997). The proportion of the gay population has been a debate for decades. According to Stewart (1996), about five million people in the United States form part of this minority group. They are becoming not only an important part of the workforce but also an important market segment. They constitute a segment of the American population which is highly educated and is financially better off than other households (Carnevale & Stone, 1995).

People with disabilities form another group that is becoming increasingly part of the workforce. Workers with disabilities have to be integrated in the labor force by law. They have been historically stereotyped and discriminated against because of their disabilities: "Such individuals are generally viewed as not being capable employees" (Henderson, 1994a, p. 105). However, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 has been a major

piece of legislation that has tried to reverse this situation for workers with disabilities. Henderson identified the reasons the American with Disabilities Act was created:

> To (1) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (2) provide clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; (3) ensure that the federal government plays a central role in enforcing the standards established in the act on behalf of individuals with disabilities; and (4) invoke congressional authority, including the power to invoke the Fourteenth Amendment to regulate commerce, in order to address major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities. (p. 105)

Due to the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, people with disabilities benefit, as does society, because supported employment helps decrease government subsidies and increases tax revenues and productivity (p. 107).

When considering the changes in society and the workplace, it is easy to understand the significant role that diversity will play in the future competitive and organizational success. Regardless of whether one looks at diversity as a societal, a workplace, or a consumer marketing issue, these demographic changes cannot be disregarded (Jackson & Associates, 1992). The character of society and the workforce is changing and is expected to change significantly in the future. All these changes have directed many organizations to explore the business implications and have provided a strong rationale for managing diversity in the workplace.

WHY ORGANIZATIONS ARE VALUING AND MANAGING DIVERSITY

According to Triandis et al. (1994), "[m]anaging diversity means changing the culture—that is, the standard operating procedures. It requires, data, experimentation, and the discovery of the procedures that work best for each group. It is more complex than conventional management but can result in more effective organizations" (p. 773). Thomas (1992) explains that managing diversity is to empower or enable employees. Managing diversity prescribes approaches that are philosophically broad enough to encompass all dimensions of diversity (p. 315). Henderson (1994a) relates managing diversity to the accomplishment of the organization's goals. For him, managing diversity also emphasizes

the managerial skills and policies needed to optimize and emphasize every employee's contribution to the organizational goals.

Leach, George, Jackson, and LaBella (1995) used the term working with diversity in place of managing diversity. They implied that working with diversity "calls forth the challenge to be curious, inquire, interact, reflect, and experiment. It requires individuals to be respectful, curious, patient, and willing to learn" (p. 3). These authors used the term *working with diversity* rather than *managing diversity* because they believed that the word *managing* may be perceived as having a negative connotation such as controlling. However, managing diversity does not mean controlling or containing diversity, it means enabling every member of the workforce to perform to his or her full potential (Cox, 1993). For the purpose of this report, the term *managing diversity* will be used and will encompass the meaning for both working with and managing diversity.

Carnevale and Stone (1994) define valuing diversity as being responsive to a wide range of people unlike oneself, according to any number of distinctions: race, gender, class, native language, national origin, physical ability, age, sexual orientation, religion, professional experience, personal preferences, and work style. Carnevale and Stone (1994) also noted that valuing diversity involves going beyond the Golden Rule of treating others as you wish to be treated yourself, but instead involves treating others as they wish to be treated. Hayles (1992) further noted that "valuing diversity is wise for personal, social/demographic, legal and productivity/profitability reasons" (p. 186).

There are important fields that have shaped and continue shaping diversity (Simons, 1992). They have been pioneering organizations in valuing diversity. International business has been one of the pioneer fields in valuing diversity. Diversity, in this case, has emerged as a need for survival and success. Multinational corporations are forced to develop and implement strategies that could lead them to capture and retain diverse customer bases not only nationally but also throughout the world (Fernandez, 1993). They are also required to recruit and retain a diverse workforce that mirrors its market.

Diplomacy has been another area that requires valuing of diversity. Diplomatic-post employees need not only be aware of diversity issues, but need to develop skills to face the challenge of dealing with other cultures. Religious organizations have also seen how important it is to value and manage diversity to adapt their messages to other cultural

identities. They are probably the ones that "have been in the forefront of documenting, studying and learning to manage cultural differences" (p. 83).

Voluntary associations of individuals who serve overseas are also examples and pioneers in valuing diversity. Private groups concerned with health, peace, ecology, and other humanitarian objectives have also developed sophisticated training and resources to meet their needs of surviving and understanding other cultures. Similarly, disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, history, and linguistics have dealt with diversity. Diversity issues have also been the concern of those who teach philosophy and ethics. Individuals in social work and psychology have striven to understand differences between people. Educators and human resource development professionals have had to deal with different learning styles of immigrants and expatriates. Lately, Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity and Employment Equity (AA/EEO) are the regulations that encourage diversity in organizations (Simons, 1992).

Sports/athletic organizations is another group that has had the need to effectively manage diversity. Sports/athletic organizations include group dynamics, behavioral processes, social interaction, socialization, and subcultures. Sports have become more institutionalized, especially at the highest levels of amateur and professional athletic events, and have come to reflect the corporate/commodity model, which makes sports more like work than play (Frey & Eitzen, 1991). An athletic team's win-loss record many times is used to measure its effectiveness. Similarly, a business organization's profit-loss record is used to measure its efficiency. Comparable to organizations, an athletic team designs policies and procedures to recruit, socialize, train, and promote its team members. These policies and procedures are strategically used to make the team more effective, so they can compete and win (Guttmann, 1988).

In many professional athletic teams, players come from all parts of the world, different cultures, speak different languages, eat different foods, have different levels of education, and hold different values. To win and be competitive, the team members need to understand and appreciate each other's differences and work toward an overall team goal. Murrell and Gaertner (1992) conducted a study that examined team interaction and performance outcomes in football teams. They found that there was a significant difference between members of winning versus losing teams involving issues of team unity and cooperation, and interpersonal conflict. Players who were members of winning teams rated

team unity and cooperation as more important, and interpersonal conflict as less favorable than players on teams with losing records.

Rossett and Bickham (1994) identified five reasons for organizations getting involved in diversity programs: (1) compliance (want to do what is expected of them by taxpayers, shareholder, society), (2) harmony (want all employees to understand and appreciate each other), (3) inclusion (want underrepresented employees to succeed), (4) justice (want to correct past wrongs), and (5) transformation (want to change the way the organization does business in order to take into account diverse employees, customers, and markets).

Many companies trace their diversity initiatives to the Workforce 2000 report (Johnston & Packer, 1987), which greatly intensified concern for the effective utilization of an increasingly diverse workforce. However, many believe that the concern for managing diversity started with AA/EEO. Traditionally, AA/EEO requirements have been based upon social, moral, and legal obligations. While many companies are still obligated to comply with AA/EEO policies today, they are convinced that programs and processes for managing diversity go beyond compliance with AA/EEO policies because they are directly connected to bottom-line business issues (Cox, 1991; Cox & Blake, 1991; Elshult & Little, 1990; Fernandez, 1993; Morrison, 1992; Sabur, 1991; Thomas, 1991). As Gottfredson (1992) points out, "Our nation must work harder to help all workers develop themselves to their fullest and . . . such efforts are required not only in the interest of social justice, but also to maintain competitiveness in the global marketplace" (p. 279).

To understand diversity and its importance to the competitive process of companies, it is necessary to understand the difference between managing diversity and AA/EEO initiatives. Fernandez (1993) summarized the differences in the following table:

Table 1

The Differences Between Managing Diversity and AA/EEO

Managing Diversity	AA/EEO
Reason: Proactive and based on business reality and needs.	*Reason: Reactive and based on governmental law and moral imperatives.*
1. Top management plays crucial leading roles	1. Top management delegates the leading roles to AA/EEO administrators
2. AA/EEO is a crucial part of the diversity strategy	2. AA/EEO is a separate strategy
3. Strategic part of the business plan	3. Nonstrategic, not tied into the business plan (except in progressive companies)
4. A strong linkage to managerial performance evaluations and rewards	4. No real linkage to managerial performance evaluations and rewards
5. A crucial strategy linked to team-building and quality efforts	5. A corporate strategy not linked to team-building and quality efforts
6. A wide variety of programs that affect the organization's cultural values and norms	6. Targeted special programs with little strategic focus that have no significant impact on the organization's cultural values
7. Long-term linked commitments that use ongoing acquired knowledge as building blocks for future strategies, plans, and goals	7. Short-term, unlinked commitments with very little building on acquired knowledge for the next steps
8. Emphasizes strategies to more effectively manage a diverse customer base, a more diverse stakeholder base, and a more diverse influencer base	8. Emphasize strategies to deal primarily with employees, not customers, influencers, and stakeholders
9. Inclusive (focuses on all employees regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, personality, sexual orientation, physical/mental limitations, and so on)	9. Exclusive (primarily focuses on women and people of color)
10. Respects, values, understands, and appreciates differences	10. Attempts to make individuals conform to organizational norms
11. Produces significant change in reward, recognition, and benefit programs	11. Reward, recognition, and benefit programs not changed
12. Both an internal and external strategy, (i.e., a crucial aspect is to be actively involved in community and social issues around diversity)	12. Primarily an internal strategy (i.e., only a limited involvement in community and societal issues to meet governmental requirements)

Source: Fernandez (1993), pp. 294-295.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Many other individuals have also differentiated managing diversity from AA/EEO (Bolick & Nestleroth, 1988; Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Gottfredson, 1992; Griggs, 1991; Henderson, 1994a; Jackson & Alvarez, 1992; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Thomas, 1992). AA/EEO policies are important steps in opening the workplace to diversity. However, alone, they are limited and do not create conditions that capitalize on the full potential of diversity. While AA/EEO policies have greatly increased the recruitment and hiring of women and minorities, they have done little to ensure their promotion or retention. Managing diversity differs from AA/EEO programs in that diversity programs tend to have broader goals and means for improving organizational climate. Managing diversity initiatives are "efforts to create an environment that works naturally for the 'total' diversity mixture" (Thomas, 1992, p. 308), not just women and minorities (Gottfredson, 1992). Griggs (1991) noted that companies which have been successful as AA/EEO employers are now realizing that the diverse workforce they created needs to be better managed in order for them to fully maximize their human resource potential and increase their competitive edge.

Finney (1989) examined the reasons four companies implemented diversity programs. She found that these companies did not implement their diversity programs because it was the social, legal, or "in" thing to do. They did it because it was the right thing to do for their company's needs, circumstances, and philosophy. These companies developed diversity programs to address the needs of their workers, satisfy the demands of their competitiveness, or fulfill the requirements of their role in the community. It is important to note that these companies were extremely visionary and were some of the first companies to start implementing diversity programs. Similarly, Work (1993) believed that while the needs for managing diversity may appear to grow mainly out of notions of social and economic "fairness" and "morality," the clear and central need for effectively managing diversity is maintaining and improving corporate productivity and profitability in national and global competition.

Organizational participants are willing to accept change related to diversity only if the potential benefits are clear and worthwhile (Thomas, 1992). Thomas further noted that seeing diversity as a business issue does not mean that it no longer has legal, moral, or social responsibility implications, but, rather, that awareness of the business implications is necessary for sufficient motivation to implement strategies for managing diversity. Similarly, Griggs (1995) believed that most people do not value diversity until they

perceive it to be in their self-interest to do so. In fact, it is informed self-interest that constitutes the only sound reason for valuing diversity, whether at the personal, interpersonal, or organizational level (p. 7).

Triandis and Bhawuk (1994) conclude that the following are some of the common reasons companies involve themselves in diversity management:

- By the year 2000, women and minorities will constitute 62% of the U.S. workforce and 80% of new entrants.
- One third of all workers will be 50 years or older by the year 2000.
- Competition for highly skilled, qualified employees will intensify in the coming years.
- To position the company as an employer of "choice."
- To employ talented women and minorities in the company.
- To position the company as a leader in the marketplace for customers, vendors, potential employees, and shareholders.
- Only those companies that have cultures which support diversity will be able to retain the best talent necessary to remain competitive.
- Addressing diversity will improve community and public support for the company's business agenda.
- Addressing legal requirements associated with Title VII, disabled workers, sexual harassment, and so on. (p. 13)

Surveys of business leaders indicate that interest in managing diversity is widespread (Jackson & Associates, 1992). For example, in one study of 645 firms, 74% of the respondents were concerned about increased diversity, and of these about one-third felt that diversity affected their corporate strategy. When the company executives were asked why they were so concerned about managing diversity, they mentioned two primary reasons: (1) perception that supervisors did not know how to motivate their diverse work groups, and (2) uncertainty about how to handle the challenge of communicating with

employees whose cultural backgrounds result in differing assumptions, values, and sometimes language skills (Towers Perrin & Hudson Institute, 1990). Some companies have connected higher turnover rates for women and minorities to a work environment that does not support diversity (Cox & Blake, 1991; Kilborn, 1990). Consequently, the lack of support for diversity has incurred excessive recruiting and training costs (Caudron, 1990; Schmidt, 1988).

Jackson and Alvarez (1992) concluded that the two economic forces that are especially relevant to workforce diversity are the shift from a manufacturing based economy to a service economy, and the globalization of the marketplace. Jackson and Alvarez believed that with 78% of American jobs in the service area, diversity issues will gain in importance because in a service economy effective interactions and communications between people are essential to business success. Triandis et al. (1994) concur that "Delivering service products requires employees with well-developed interpersonal skills; [and that] cultural similarity between the service provider and the customer may improve the effectiveness of service delivery and the perceived quality of service" (p. 770). Several studies have found that race and gender affect interaction between employees and customers in service businesses (Juni, Brannon, & Roth, 1988; McCormick & Kinloch, 1986; Stead & Zinkhan, 1986). Some organizations believe that with a diverse employee population, they can better understand customers' needs in ethnic and international markets (Adler, 1983; Griggs, 1991).

Increased competition and the changing marketplace are convincing many business leaders that diversity should be an essential part of their business strategy. Corporate leaders have decided to incorporate diversity for four business reasons: (1) to keep and gain market share, (2) to reduce costs, (3) to increase productivity, and (4) to improve the quality of management in their organizations (Morrison, 1992). Others have cited similar findings. For example, Cox and Blake (1991) noted that companies that learn how to manage diversity acquire a competitive advantage over companies that do not know how to deal with diversity. They found that sound management of diversity positively affects cost savings, employee selection, creativity, problem solving, flexibility, marketing, and resource acquisition. Triandis et al. (1994) reported that those companies that "manage diversity well are more likely to gain competitive advantages, attain increased productivity from available human resources, and reduce the intergroup conflict cost" (p. 775).

Copeland (1988) interviewed 100 line managers, EEO professionals and personnel administrators, and 25 crosscultural educators and trainers. The purpose of her study was to identify why employers need to value diversity. She found out that there are ten reasons to value diversity. She identified demographic changes, competition, high levels of productivity, expanding markets, and new sources for talent as some of the important values that can be derived from diversity in the workplace.

Some managers believe that a diverse workforce can outperform a homogeneous one of comparable talent. Although, managing heterogeneity may be more difficult in the beginning than managing homogeneity, most organizations, communities, and countries do not have the option of working in a homogeneous environment (Thomas, 1992). Therefore, it is becoming necessary that individuals and organizations become aware of the many advantages associated with having a heterogeneous work environment (Griggs, 1995).

Several studies have provided evidence that diverse groups produce higher-quality ideas and are more likely to reach high-quality decisions than groups that have similar members (McGrath, 1984; McLeod & Lobel, 1992; Milliken & Martins, 1996; Triandis, Hall, & Ewen, 1965; Watson, Kumar, & Michaelsen, 1993; Willems & Clark, 1977). Bantel and Jackson (1989) appraised the diversity of top management teams in 199 banks and found that the greater the diversity of the team, the greater the number of administrative innovations. These authors considered diverse teams related to tenure and age, as well as educational and functional backgrounds. They did not include gender and race as variables in their study. Therefore, the findings of this study may not be generalized to diverse teams in terms of gender, race, or any other variable not considered in the study. However, a recent study conducted by Bantel and Jackson (1996), in which management research on how different types of diversity affects group outcomes was reviewed, revealed that, regardless of their type of diversity, groups may be able to obtain benefits from a greater variety of perspectives inherent within a diverse group.

Hoffman and Maier (1961) investigated the effects of heterogeneity with respect to gender and personality in quality of problem solving. They formed homogeneous and heterogeneous groups of undergraduate students of psychology and human relations and conducted a laboratory study on them. From this experiment, Hoffman and Maier discovered that heterogeneous groups were relatively superior to homogeneous groups in

problem-solving ability. They found out that mixing sexes in groups enhanced the quality of solutions to problems. Once again, it may not be proper to generalize their findings to heterogeneous groups related to race because race was not a variable considered in this study. The researchers operationalized heterogeneity in terms of gender and personality only. However, a more recent study conducted by Watson et al. (1993), in which race and gender were the variables being studied, showed that ethically diverse teams viewed situations in a broader range of perspectives and are able to "outperform homogeneous groups on complex problem solving tasks" (p. 598).

Another advantage is that even though diverse groups may encounter more difficulties than homogeneous groups at the forming stage (Watson et al., 1993) or may take more time to reach a decision (Hoffman, Harburg, & Maier, 1962), they are more likely to seek the full range of possible solutions to the problem than a homogeneous group (Ellis & Fisher, 1994). Altogether, people of different cultures bring a variety of perspectives and outlooks to a task; such diversity may add to the pool of resources available to a group (Adler, 1991; Nelton, 1988). Diversity can increase the potential group productivity (S. Jackson, 1991; McGrath, 1984) and the quality of ideas generated by the group (McLeod & Lobel, 1992; Watson et al., 1993). Hayles (1996) concludes that higher performance of homogeneous groups occurs both in quality and quantity.

For companies to have effective employee work groups/teams that support one another's efforts, they must get their employees to value, respect, and accommodate people who are different from themselves in terms of race, ethnicity, language, culture, religion, age, ability, status, sexual orientation, family structure, and so forth (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1994). A survey by the American Productivity and Quality Center found that half of the 467 large firms in their study planned to rely significantly more on self-managing employee work groups/teams (Dumaine, 1990). In most companies, when employee work groups/teams are formed, diversity is certain because in today's complex and pluralistic world homogeneous groups are rarely found (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1994).

For many organizations, managing diversity is a viability issue in at least six ways:

1. Organizational workforces are diverse and will become even more diverse. The organization that utilizes these resources more efficiently and effectively will gain a competitive advantage.

2. Some companies are pursuing total quality. All approaches to quality call for empowering the total workforce. Assuming a diverse workforce, this requires managing diversity capabilities.

3. Independent of total quality, some corporations are seeking greater employee involvement and more participatory decisionmaking. In the context of a diverse workforce, this cannot be done without managing diversity capability.

4. Other corporations are implementing "high commitment work teams." Given the diverse workforce, the desired level of commitment cannot be achieved without the ability to manage diversity.

5. Others are running as lean as possible, thereby placing a premium on tapping the potential of all resources. With respect to human resources and with a diverse workforce, managing diversity capability is required.

6. Corporate external environments are also becoming more diverse. Effective management or internal diversity will facilitate management of external diversity (Thomas, 1992, p. 316)

Loden and Rosener (1991) believe that embracing diversity will require organizations to invest time, effort, energy, and commitment, but it will result in significant long-term advantages. The most likely long-term advantages will include

- the full utilization of the organization's human capital.
- reduced interpersonal conflict among others as respect for diversity increases.
- enhanced work relationships based on mutual respect and increased employee knowledge of multicultural issues.
- a shared organizational vision and increased commitment among diverse employees at all organizational levels and across all functions.
- greater innovation and flexibility as others participate more fully in key decision-making and problem-solving groups.

- improved productivity as more employee effort is directed at accomplishing tasks and less energy is spent managing interpersonal conflicts and culture clash. (p. 220)

In summary, valuing or managing diversity is a bottom line issue for organizations (Johnson, 1995). Possibly the simplest and the strongest rationale for managing diversity stems from the potential to increase productivity among all workers, especially among those groups of workers that have historically been underrepresented and underutilized. Examples of these groups include women, people of color, people with physical disabilities, older workers, and gay or lesbian employees (Ehrlich & Garland, 1988; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Stewart, 1991). Although it is not legally required that organizations manage diversity; it is in the best interest of American corporations to develop and use the talents and energies of all their workforce. Managing diversity's goal is to develop an environment that takes into consideration all dimensions of diversity and works for all employees at all levels in the organization (Griggs, 1995; Loden & Rosener, 1991).

BARRIERS TO MANAGING DIVERSITY

Although there are enormous benefits, as was mentioned above, to effectively managing diversity in an organization, there are still many barriers that first must be resolved before the advantages can be reached. Therefore, it is important to recognize the barriers that may get in the way of an individual's or an organization's ability to value and manage diversity now and in the future. There have been many barriers that have inhibited the employment and advancement of diverse groups in the workforce. Some of the most significant barriers identified in the literature are described below.

Stereotypes and Prejudice

According to Loden and Rosener (1991), "Stereotype is a fixed and distorted generalization made about all members of a particular group" (p. 58). Prejudice can be defined as the tendency to have prior negative judgment toward ". . . people who are different from some reference group in terms of sex, ethnic background or racial characteristics such as skin color" (Morrison, 1992, pp. 34-35). Henderson (1994a) defines prejudice as "a conclusion drawn without adequate knowledge or evidence"

(p. 133). The existence and the functions of stereotyping have been researched and documented by many individuals (Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Devine, 1989; Fernandez, 1993; Morrison, 1992; Wilder, 1986).

A study conducted by Catalyst (1990) revealed that stereotyping, preconceptions, and exclusion were some of the most serious career hurdles for women managers. These findings coincide with the findings provided by the Executive Leadership Council's study (Baskerville & Tucker, 1991) in which 50 top African American executives of large American corporations were surveyed. This study revealed that many barriers that have hindered the advancement of women managers are very similar to the restrictions imposed on African American executives. Similarly, Morrison (1992) surveyed 196 managers from 16 organizations and found that the biggest barrier for nontraditional (women and minorities) managers is prejudice. She observed that, while Affirmative Action legislation provided access to opportunities, it did little to address the underlying assumptions and stereotypes that plagued nontraditional employees and created barriers to advancement that persist today.

Myths and stereotypes affect most nontraditional workers: women, minorities, people with disabilities, and older workers. Stereotypes about women are certainly less positive than those of men (Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Henderson, 1994a; Smith & Stewart, 1983). For example, women are often assumed to be passive, indecisive, emotional, and unable to be analytical (Summers, 1991). Stereotypes about minorities are less positive than those of whites (Cose, 1991; Sigall & Page, 1971). For instance, a study conducted by Smith (1990) revealed that whites have the preconceived perception that people who are not like them are less intelligent and less hard working. Some stereotypes apply to certain minority groups in particular. Morrison (1992) found that Asian-Americans are assumed to be research oriented and not able to supervise people; Hispanics are assumed to be unassertive; and African Americans are perceived as being lazy and incompetent (p. 35). Henderson (1994a) reported that "Workers with disabilities are viewed as not capable of performing their jobs" (p. 96). Henderson went on to report that older workers are stereotyped as inferior beings and viewed as unproductive.

Sutton and Moore (1985) examined attitudes on issues pertaining to women in top management in American corporations. They surveyed 438 female and 348 male executives and found that resistance to female managers was more evident than to male managers. It

also revealed that half of the male executives surveyed would not feel comfortable having a woman as a boss. Even though these findings represented data collected over ten years ago, at a time when there were not as many women in the workforce as there are today, similar problems for women tend to remain. A more recent study conducted by Wentling (1992) in which 30 women managers from the U.S. midwest region were interviewed revealed that white male bosses often have difficulties working with women and many do not believe in the advancement of women. Similarly, a national study of the changing workforce conducted by the Families and Work Institute (Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993) found that minority workers' chances for advancement are lower than the chances for non-minority workers.

Discrimination

There are many studies reporting the presence of discrimination at the workplace (Auster, 1988; Fernandez, 1993; Galinsky et al., 1993). A U.S. Department of Labor (1992) report noted that male and female managers were very similar in responses about job satisfaction, stress, and commitment to the organization, but women rated their own promotional opportunities as much lower than those of their male peers. Over the years, surveys conducted by Fernandez (1993) have found that a majority of employees have witnessed the following examples of discrimination in their companies: Women have a much harder time finding a sponsor or mentor than men do; many women are often excluded from informal networks by men; customers do not accept a woman's authority as much as they accept a man's in similar situations; women have to be better performers than men to get ahead; many women are faced with some type of sexual harassment on the job; women are placed in jobs with no future; and women are penalized more for mistakes than men (p. 198). Fernandez (1988) found that Fortune 500 CEOs acknowledged that women in their organizations faced barriers that men did not in getting to the top.

Auster (1988) reviewed research previously conducted on bias toward women by corporate management and she observed that they centered around informal culture, selection and recruitment practices, task assignment, performance evaluation, promotion, and salary decisions. This author arrived at this conclusion based on research conducted prior to 1986. However, there are still subtle and some unsubtle forms of discrimination that remain intact, even though discrimination in the workplace has been against the law for

many years. The national study conducted by the Families and Work Institute (Galinsky et al., 1993) revealed that women and minorities are still discriminated against at work. This study showed that 27% (out of 3,400 participants) claimed to have been discriminated against at some time during their work lives (p. 33).

Harassment

Harassment still exists in many forms, both subtle and obvious. Poole (1997) defined harassment as any conduct or comment based on sexual, racial, or any other differences employees may have that is likely to cause offense and humiliation. The Black's Law Dictionary (Black, 1990) defines sexual harassment as a "type of employment discrimination, includes sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature prohibited by Federal Law" (p. 1375). Sexual harassment ranges from unwelcome casual touching to persistent requests for sexual favors. Racial or ethnic harassment may include hostility, ostracism, and verbal abuse. Collins and Blodgett (1981) conducted a survey with 2,000 subscribers to the *Harvard Business Review* and found that sexual harassment is widespread in the business world. Tomberlin (1996), discussing statistics of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), observed that since 1990 there has been a rapid increase in both the number of cases of sexual harassment filed by EEOC, and the amount of monetary damages against companies. The Human Relations Commission presented similar statistics concerning this issue (Brown, 1996).

Harassment has many negative effects. It can negatively affect employers and employees. It can be very costly to an employer in productivity as well as in cost of litigation and settlements. For example, the federal government reported an estimated cost of $189 million over a two-year period (Tang & McCollum, 1996). A study conducted by Working Woman (Sandroff, 1988), in which 160 Fortune 500 service and manufacturing companies participated, found that sexual harassment costs each of these companies $6 to $7 million on average a year in absenteeism, employee turnover, low morale, and productivity losses.

Employees who are harassed can be affected in many different forms. Harassment distracts employees from focusing on task-related responsibilities, reduces productivity,

and can lead to increased turnover. Thacker and Gohmann (1996) conducted a study to determine the consequences of sexual harassment. They surveyed over eight thousand federal employees and also found that harassment contributed to emotional and psychological trauma. Poole (1997) reported that harassment can have a negative impact on the following five areas: (1) physiological, (2) emotional, (3) career path, (4) self-perception, and (5) social and interpersonal relations. In addition, an environment where harassment goes on is not conducive to forming high-performance work teams (Dunnette & Motowidlo, 1982; Fernandez, 1993; Hotelling, 1991; Howard, 1991).

Difficulty Balancing Work and Family

Many women who work in corporations face difficulties in balancing their work and their families. The study conducted by Morrison (1992) revealed the following findings regarding this issue: the struggle to balance home and work is a difficult situation that women must deal with, and often they must make the decision to postpone and even stop their career advancement; having and taking care of children often conflicts with full-time dedication to a career; it is unfeasible for many women to continue to work evenings and weekends or travel frequently once they have children; many organizational executives do not have much understanding or sympathy for work/family conflicts that women have to solve; and competing demands between work and family represent career advancement barriers for many women.

In addition to taking care of children, many other outside responsibilities of women, such as household chores, social obligations, and significant relationships, make it harder for them to meet the high-performance standards required for advancement (Stoner & Hartman, 1990). The conflict between work and family responsibilities continues to be a barrier, forcing some working women to quit their jobs and limiting the contributions of many talented women who stay (Morrison, 1992; Stoner & Hartman, 1990). Even though balancing work and family is a barrier for the advancement of women, it is perceived as less restrictive than the barriers at the workplace. A study conducted by Heatley (1992) in which 75 women managers were surveyed found that "home-career conflicts" have less impact on their career advancement or are less detrimental than barriers such as differences in salaries, exclusion, and isolation.

Poor Career Planning and Development

Morrison (1992) stated that poor career planning and development is mostly associated with a lack of opportunity for women and minorities to get the kind of work experiences that will qualify them for top-level positions. Poor career planning is one of the most frequent barrier among women and minorities. In addition, Morrison observed that organizational decisionmakers are often reluctant to assign women and minorities to the challenging, high-profile jobs that are required to add credibility to their work record. Women and minorities often find that managers do not feel comfortable assuming responsibility for their advancement in a comparable manner to white males, partly because they are viewed as being less capable and, therefore, a higher risk (Gibbs, 1991; Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991; Mabry et al., 1990; Rosener, 1986; Thomas & Alderfer, 1989).

Many studies have shown that women's job experiences do not very often include the types of job assignments and development experiences required for senior-level jobs (Morrison, 1992; Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987; Ohlott, Ruderman, & McCauley, 1991; Van Velsor & Hughes, 1990). Morrison (1992) found that women and minorities are usually given assignments that are less challenging, less visible, and not as important as the ones given to white males. She observed that these types of assignments accumulate and result in limited opportunities for future promotions. Catalyst (1993) reported that credential building experiences and career enhancing assignments are often unavailable to minorities and women. Wentling (1992) and Catalyst (1990) also found that the lack of career planning and planned job assignments for women is a serious barrier to their advancement. DiTomaso, Thompson, and Blake (1988) identified lack of promotion opportunities and the preponderance of staff assignments as the highest ranking factors that hinder the successful advancement of minorities. Women and minorities often do not know what is expected of them for upward advancement (Morrison, 1992).

Lack of Organizational Political Savvy

Lack of organizational political savvy is another barrier affecting women and minorities at work. Wentling (1992) studied 30 women in middle-level management positions and found that, in many instances, women have difficulty conforming to company norms, fitting in, adapting to the organizational culture, knowing whom to

approach for support, or determining the organization's informal power structure. She also found that women have difficulty perceiving the organizational political environment due to lack of accessibility of information. These findings are applied to women in management, but they could also apply to minorities because Morrison (1992) found that lack of political savvy is also a barrier for minorities. According to Morrison, women and people of color do not seem to pay enough attention to organizational politics and often fail to advance. Furthermore, they have difficulty perceiving the organization's political environment accurately (Wentling, 1992).

Morrison (1992) identified two other issues related to lack of organizational political savvy. Women and minorities many times lack the information about how the organization's political system works or how they can make it work to their advantage. Another common disadvantage among women and people of color is the inability to establish and/or become part of networks. Because of their lack of networking they do not get as much information about industry trends and where their companies are destined. Without strong networks, it is difficult to gain expertise in corporate politics and obtain valuable information needed to operate within the organization's informal power structure (Morrison, 1992; Wentling, 1992).

Unsupportive Work Environment

Morrison (1992) found that women and minorities are often treated differently than their male colleagues. For example, they may be excluded from luncheons, social events, and even informal gatherings within the office. In addition, they may not have access to the information they need in order to make informed decisions (Wentling, 1992). Women and people of color are constantly under scrutiny; therefore, they must consistently demonstrate competency on the job, for they are under enormous pressure to do outstanding work continuously (Wentling, 1992). This creates a serious problem in that, if they need help, they cannot admit it and ask for help for fear of being marked as incompetent. Because of the pressure to be consistently outstanding and the need to avoid serious mistakes, their not asking for help can result in detrimental consequences (Morrison, 1992; Wentling, 1992).

Another factor that contributes to an unsupportive work environment for women and people of color is a lack of role models and mentors, especially for those moving above

middle management positions. Most people want to surround themselves with others like themselves. Even though people from different backgrounds may be just as competent as those who look, talk, and behave the same, often managers tend to hire and promote people like themselves (Carnevale & Stone, 1994). White men are usually not devoted to assisting and supporting someone with a different perspective or values and may find it difficult to associate with such an individual (Morrison, 1992). This tendency adversely affects women and people of color who are more likely to be different from the decisionmakers who are making recommendations that affect their career advancement (Hanover, 1993).

Exclusion and Isolation

The tendency for individuals to favor people who are like themselves has been well documented (Avery, 1979; Bernardin & Beatty, 1984; Brewer & Kramer, 1985; Cascio, 1982; Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992; Wexley & Nemeroff, 1974). Most people tend to feel more comfortable around people who are like themselves; therefore, managers many times tend to hire, promote, and make major project assignments to people like themselves, rather than those who are different. Women and people of color often receive less feedback from managers than from other employees, due to uncertainty about how the feedback will be received and from concerns about legal ramifications (Jamieson & O'Mara, 1991; Jones, 1982). Without feedback on job performance, women and people of color cannot improve their work, corrections cannot be made, and problems can escalate until they are beyond repair.

Women and people of color are often not included or invited to participate in informal settings like playing golf or after-hours gatherings which provide the setting for strengthening business relationships and making informal business decisions. Sometimes women and people of color feel like outsiders, which can lead to personal and professional alienation (Dunnette & Motowidlo, 1982; Hymowitz, 1989; Rosener, 1986; Schwartz, 1989).

Qualifications and Performance Questioned

There is a tendency to question the qualifications of employees who have satisfied an organization's Affirmative Action goal (Cose, 1991; Elfin, with Burke, 1993; Gates, 1993; Gleckman, Smart, Dwyer, Segal, & Weber, 1991; Summers, 1991). Many times managers may have different expectations of performance for employees, based upon their race or sex. For example, when a man fails, there is tendency to blame it on a temporary setback, lack of effort, or bad luck. But, when a woman fails, there is a tendency to blame a more personal factor such as lack of ability or competence. Expectations that white men will succeed at tasks are stronger than expectations for the success of women and people of color (Fiske & Taylor, 1984). Many times Affirmative Action is used to explain the success of women and people of color and their abilities on the job are discounted (Garcia, Erskine, Hawn, & Casmay, 1981). The notion that you have to expect less from women and people of color is an assumption so pervasive that it sometimes affects their perceptions of themselves (Morrison, 1992).

Lack of Mentors

Mentors have been defined as higher ranking, influential, senior organizational members with advanced experience and knowledge who are committed to providing upward mobility and support to a protégé's professional career (Collins, 1983; Kram, 1985; Roche, 1979). Since most high ranking, influential, senior organizational members with advanced experience are white males, they are in the most likely position to be mentors. White male mentors may not even consider women or people of color as candidates for protégé roles because they may be more comfortable in developing a professional and personal relationship with another white male. A number of studies have found that a key element in the selection process is the degree to which the mentor identifies with the protégé and perceives the protégé as a younger version of himself (Blackburn, Chapman, & Cameron, 1981; Bowers, 1984; Lunding, Clements, & Perkins, 1978). The selection process may, therefore, be biased by the tendency of white male mentors to choose other white males over female or people of color protégés. White male mentors may be reluctant to sponsor female or people of color protégés because they perceive them as being a greater risk than their white male counterparts (Fitt & Newton, 1989). Given that

women and people of color are numerically rare in top-level management positions, they may be seen as a bigger risk to sponsor by a mentor.

Lack of mentors and role models are barriers for many women and people of color. Mentors are extremely important to women and people of color, especially since they need the guidance, encouragement, and advocacy that mentors can provide to overcome such obstacles as isolation, lack of credibility, and lack of political savvy (Jeruchim & Shapiro, 1992; Morrison, 1992). Without the kind of career guidance often provided by mentors or a systematic career planning program, it is easy for women and people of color to choose certain job assignments for the wrong reasons. The lack of mentoring for women and people of color makes them particularly vulnerable to poor career decisions. Not having a mentor who is trustworthy and knowledgeable about career mobility is a factor that further contributes to the problem of unwise career decisions (Morrison, 1992).

Backlash

In a study conducted by Morrison (1992), organizational managers mentioned backlash more than any other problem as a weakness in their diversity efforts, and some managers cited backlash as a barrier in itself to the advancement of women and people of color. Chemers, Oskamp, and Constanzo (1995) describe backlash as follows:

> Negative reactions to the development of power by women and minorities can be characterized as a form of backlash. This may be called diversity backlash when applied to organizations, which occurs when minority members are perceived as attempting to develop power by individual or collective means. Diversity backlash can be characterized as a preemptive strike against the development of power of groups lacking power in organizations. Typically, it occurs before power has actually been obtained by minority groups; it is a reaction to the threat of loss of power by the majority group. (p. 106)

A survey conducted by Nelson-Horchler (1991) showed that 35% of male managers believe that their companies discriminate against men to rectify past bias against women (only 10% of women agreed). Faludi (1991) noted that backlash against women has constantly been driven by the perception that women are developing power and making progress toward equality. Backlash was found to be one of the ten most significant restraining forces in the advancement of black senior executives (Baskerville & Tucker,

1991). Feelings of resentment and fear has prompted some white men to rebel against their organizations' Affirmative Action and diversity efforts by undermining diversity practices (Morrison, 1992).

Some organizations that have made an attempt to break down barriers that are encountered by women and people of color by being supportive and providing individualized attention are sometime accused of providing special treatment. Some of these organizations have even been charged with reverse discrimination (Alderfer, 1982; Fernandez, 1991; Gleckman et al., 1991; Lawlor, 1992; Tilove, 1991). Backlash is also prompted when women and people of color are given opportunities that white males were not given, such as faster promotions or invitations to special meeting or social events (Morrison, 1992). Breaking traditions by providing any of these kinds of opportunities to women and people of color upsets some white males. Many white males believe that what they now face in the U.S. workplace is reverse discrimination, that qualified white men are losing out on jobs and promotions to unqualified women and people of color.

News media, books, and articles have basically presented an image that all it takes to succeed is to be a woman or a person of color (Fernandez, 1993). However, the statistics from such sources as the U.S. Department of Labor (1992) show the opposite. Most managers or occupational workers who believe they were discriminated against actually were not promoted because of lack of skills, ability, potential, or because of some subjective evaluation on the part of the company (Fernandez, 1993). Many authors have noted that part of the reason some white males resist diversity activities is because they perceive themselves as being excluded from diversity concerns and, in some cases, they are actually seen as the cause of the concern. In most organizations, white males dominate the culture and are typically the power holders, which may cause resentment from the nontraditional workers in the organization. Many white men are uncertain about where they will fit into organizations in which valuing and managing diversity is a priority (Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Fernandez, 1993; Loden & Rosener, 1991; Mobley & Payne, 1992; Thiederman, 1991). While some white men resist diversity programs because they fear exclusion, some women and people of color also are resistant because they fear inclusion. For example, "They hesitate to participate in diversity support networks, because they do not want to be seen as outside the mainstream. They feel they can make it on their own credentials" (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 37).

In summary, a variety of barriers have kept minorities from advancing in organizations. Determining what concerns and barriers are the most critical to employees is an important part of moving forward and is one of the first steps in effective diversity efforts. Although the specific barriers to advancement vary from one organization to another, their effect is the same. Barriers that prevent women and people of color from advancing deprive any organization from preparing a full force of potential leaders to take over in the future (Carnevale & Stone, 1995; Fernandez, 1993; Morrison, 1992).

STRATEGIES FOR MANAGING DIVERSITY

Understanding the historical assumptions made about employee diversity within the American workplace is critical to understanding the ways in which institutions manage diversity today (Loden & Rosener, 1991). Most American institutions and managers continue to relate to employee diversity based on the following six traditional assumptions:

1. Otherness is a deficiency.
2. Diversity poses a threat to the organization's effective functioning.
3. Expressed discomfort with the dominant group's values is oversensitivity.
4. Members of all diverse groups want to become and should be more like the dominant group.
5. Equal treatment means the same treatment.
6. Managing diversity requires changing the people, not the organizational culture. (pp. 27-28)

Although, these assumptions have been challenged, they still remain implanted in many organizations. Loden and Rosener (1991) concluded that some organizations are changing their cultures in support of greater employee diversity.

During the last decade, many organizations have responded to the increase in diversity with programs designed to manage diversity in the workplace (Beilinson, 1991;

Cox; 1991, Geber, 1990; Gottfredson, 1992; C. Jackson, 1991; Lamb, 1991; Purnell & Tervalon, 1991; Robinson, 1991; Sanders, 1991; Savoie, 1991; Thomas, 1990; Walker, 1991):

> Examples of such programs include nontraditional work arrangements, such as flextime and home work stations; education and training programs intended to reduce stereotyping, increase cultural sensitivity, and develop skills for working in multicultural environments; career management programs designed to promote constructive feedback to employees, mentoring relationships, and access to informal networks; and new employee benefits, such as parental leave and dependent-care assistance. (S. Jackson, 1992, p. 3)

Winterle (1992) conducted research for The Conference Board and studied 166 leading corporations and, based on the results, developed an inventory of diversity initiatives and grouped them into the following topical areas: communications activities, education and training classes, employee-involvement initiatives, career development and career planning activities, performance and accountability initiatives, and culture-change initiatives.

Morrison (1982) grouped the diversity practices found in 16 exemplary organizations into four groups: (1) diversity, (2) accountability, (3) development, and (4) recruitment practices. Similarly, by using several case studies based on large American corporations, Gottfredson (1992) was able to group diversity activities into five categories: (1) procedures to reduce ethnic and gender differences in career outcomes, (2) procedures to accommodate immigrants to the United States, (3) changes in organizational climate to value and utilize ethnic and gender differences, (4) changes in procedures or climate to accommodate individual differences among employees, and (5) decentralized problem solving to accommodate local conditions. The first three categories listed above address diversity issues related to ethnicity and gender, and the last two categories encompass all individual differences and are directed to all employees.

Wheeler (1995) conducted a different study for The Conference Board. He surveyed and interviewed 69 diversity managers, consultants, and academicians and found seven innovative diversity initiatives. Those practices were (1) incorporation of diversity into mission statement, (2) diversity action plans, (3) accountability in business objectives, (4) employee involvement from all levels and functions, (5) career development and

planning, (6) community involvement and outreach, and (7) long-term initiatives directed at overall culture change.

Although there is a wide range of approaches and strategies for managing diversity, there is no single approach or strategy that can be recommended for all organizational situations. Even though there is no method that contains all the necessary ingredients for success in managing diversity, several individuals have developed steps and/or procedures that can assist organizations in successfully managing diversity. Morrison (1992) cited five major steps involved in the process of putting diversity into action. The first step is to identify the diversity problems in the organization by collecting relevant information. The second step is strengthening top management commitment by getting them involved in the diversity effort. The third step is to select practices that fit the organization's needs and problems and develop a balanced diversity strategy. The fourth step is to measure the specific results of the diversity efforts. The final step is to establish a process that ensures ongoing successful diversity efforts. Similarly, Baytos (1992) stated six steps that are needed to start successful diversity activities. The first step is to establish a clear business rationale for the initiative. Other steps include seeking employee input; converting employee input into action steps; setting the timing, focus, and breadth of training; monitoring initiatives; and assessing results.

Louw (1995) identified five phases in the overall process of managing diversity: (1) needs analysis—answer the questions why, what, how, when, where, and who of the managing diversity strategy; (2) diversity strategy design—develop goals, objectives, methods, dimensions, management, actions, priorities, and resources of plan; (3) development—form specific interventions and initiatives related to diversity; (4) implementation—develop a plan that answers who, when, where, and how the diversity interventions and initiatives will be accomplished; and (5) maintenance—evaluate and monitor diversity efforts to ensure ongoing improvement. In addition, Louw identified the following eight principles required for managing diversity successfully: (1) use a holistic, integrated approach; (2) obtain top management commitment and accountability; (3) consciously work to integrate diversity values into the broader organizational values; (4) integrate responsibility for diversity initiatives into other management functions and initiatives; (5) integrate diversity efforts with existing strategic objectives and programs; (6) expect resistance to change, and take steps to minimize it; (7) use a participative

management approach; and (8) be instrumental or facilitative rather than charismatic or autocratic in leading diversity initiatives.

After discussing several case studies, Gottfredson (1992) offered the following nine diversity principles to enhance management practice: (1) develop individuals, not groups; (2) stress variance, not just average differences; (3) treat group differences as important, but not special; (4) tailor treatment to individuals, not groups; (5) find the common ground; (6) reexamine but maintain high standards; (7) test assumptions and support claims; (8) solicit feedback; and (9) set high but realistic goals. Similarly, Baytos (1995) suggested the following points when practicing diversity management: guide the initiatives with strategic perspectives; start the change process with careful assessment of one's own bias; secure commitment from senior management and entire organization by developing business rationale; use nontraditional organization approaches to address diversity issues; conduct solid diversity research to identify issues and use them as a base to measure progress; move quickly from research result to implementation; and measure progress and impact of diversity efforts, and use the results to reinforce the commitment of the organization.

Griggs (1995) identified four steps to meeting the challenge of managing people who are different from ourselves: (1) acknowledge the differences; (2) educate yourself about differences by reading, listening, and putting yourself in situations where the other group is dominant; (3) figure out how the person you are working with is like or not like what you have learned about the group of which he or she is a member; and (4) work to value and appreciate those differences. Further, Griggs stressed that once we gather as much cultural information as we can, then we must look at and analyze it to see if it is relevant to the individual with whom we are dealing.

Leading-edge organizations have numerous unique efforts under way to manage diversity (Loden & Rosener, 1991). Some common practices that distinguish these organizations from others include diversity linked to strategic vision; management responsibility for climate setting; systems and procedures that support diversity; ongoing monitoring of recruitment, promotion, and development trends; organizational commitment to technical reeducation; awareness education as an organizational priority; rewards based on results; enhanced benefits; reinforcement of the value of diversity in hiring and promotions; and attention to subtle reinforcement of the homogeneous ideal (pp. 166-167).

Northern States Power is one of the many organizations that have developed exemplary diversity strategies. The company has a strategic multifaceted plan that includes the following components:

- Create employment policies and practices that support the company's commitment to diversity (including performance, potential, career planning and counseling systems, training and development strategies, diverse career tracks with appropriate resources, and leading-edge flexible-benefit packages).
- Integrate workforce diversity goals with all organizational design activities.
- Create an organizational structure to support the company's commitment to diversity.
- Establish link between diversity goals and performance review and reward systems.
- Establish shared values throughout the organization to support the company's vision of diversity.
- Develop a diverse mix of qualified candidates to ensure that the workforce of the company mirrors the communities in which it serves.
- Provide employees with the skills needed to perform in a culturally diverse environment.
- Create an atmosphere/culture in which all employees take ownership of the diversity problems and recognize they are part of the problem as well as the solution.
- Create an organizational culture where racist, ethnocentric, and sexist language is totally absent. (Fernandez, 1993, pp. 300-301)

Leadership commitment and the revision of policies and benefits so that they support diverse needs are essential elements for building diversity (Carnevale & Stone, 1994). Before diversity can be valued and properly managed in any organization, the organization's leadership must be committed to it. Leaders/managers need to get directly involved in making things happen. Leaders need to lead by example and hold others accountable. They warn that any diversity initiatives which proceed without leadership commitment will have little impact if employees view management as not supportive of

diversity efforts. When people are engaged in diversity initiatives and leadership commitment is lacking, it is important to stop and design a strategy to get it. Commitment takes time to develop, and leaders/managers need to understand the benefits and process involved in managing diversity. Many organizations use accountability as a key component in ensuring commitment to diversity from their managers (p. 27).

Some organizations have managers develop their own diversity goals and specific ways to demonstrate their support for diversity. Other organizations connect performance-appraisal ratings, compensation, and even annual bonuses to the achievement of diversity goals (Caudron, 1992). Morrison (1992) found that companies are beginning to attach consequences to diversity-related performance. Morrison also observed that leaders competent in developing and capitalizing on diversity are essential to the success of American organizations. Further, Loden and Rosener (1991) stated that, to set the stage for changing the organizational culture, company leaders must take an influential and visible role from the very beginning. Specifically, their role must focus on acknowledging the fundamental difference between equal employment opportunity and valuing diversity, endorsing the value of diversity and communicating this throughout the organization, and articulating a pluralistic vision (p. 197).

Doing the following things may help organizations ensure that their valuing and managing diversity efforts will make a lasting difference for both the people and the organization: assess organizational readiness and need before beginning; think and plan long-term, systemwide, and systematically; align diversity efforts with strategic business objectives; integrate diversity efforts with other large-scale organizational change efforts; and measure performance results against program/process objectives and strategic organizational goals (Johnson, 1995). When an organization follows these steps, it is less likely that diversity efforts will be dropped or left unsupported in time of crisis or change, such as mergers and downsizing. However, without leadership and effective management, diversity efforts remain fragmented and lack cohesion. Coordination of diversity efforts needs to be assigned to a competent leader who can build relationships across functions and levels of the organization (Tomervik, 1995).

Many companies are beginning to evaluate and adjust policies and benefits that were initially designed for a more homogeneous workforce. Bolick and Nestleroth (1988) investigated many policies and benefits that specific organizations are implementing. Some

of them included changing recruiting policies to focus on recruiting women, people of color, older workers, and people with disabilities; recruiting women into traditionally male occupations; and recruiting returning and second-career women. Other areas in which policies and benefits can be changed to support diversity include flexible work schedules, part-time scheduling, and flexible vacation and sick-leave policies; child and elder care; pay equity for all workers; benefits for partners or gay and lesbian workers; and employment opportunities for older workers that are more attractive to them than retirement would be (pp. 19-23).

In summary, organizations are undertaking a number of diversity initiatives. However, no single strategy or activity, used in isolation, is likely to constitute an adequate approach for managing diversity (Arredondo, 1996). What is needed is a careful selection of initiatives adapted to organizational needs, tied to business aims, and used strategically in an ongoing manner. Clearly, issues of managing diversity need to work their way through the strategic planning process of the organization. Diversity initiatives should not be fixed and should be modified over time as an organization's needs change. This means that an organization's diversity strategies need to be assessed and reassessed on an ongoing basis (Carnevale & Stone, 1994).

The following section specifically addresses diversity training, its process, components, barriers, and benefits. There are many reasons diversity training deserved to be examined more in detail than other diversity initiatives. First, it is one of the primary and most widely used to address diversity issues in organizations (Baytos, 1995; Carnevale & Stone, 1995; Tomervik, 1995; Wheeler, 1994). Second, diversity training is considered a critical support mechanism to successfully achieve organizational goals (Arredondo, 1996). Third, it should be well-conducted; otherwise, it may turn into backlash (Henderson, 1994b). Finally, it complements and supports most other diversity initiatives.

DIVERSITY TRAINING

Although organizations are using a broad range of initiatives in their efforts to value and manage diversity, training is one of the most widely used strategies (Tomervik, 1995). The definition for diversity training varies from organization to organization, and many times the way the organization defines diversity training is heavily influenced by the way the concept of diversity is understood in the organization (Wheeler, 1994). According to Wheeler, from the broad corporate perspective, diversity training is defined as raising personal awareness about individual differences in the workplace and how those differences inhibit or enhance the way people work together and get work done. In the narrowest sense, it is education about compliance—Affirmative Action (AA), Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), and sexual harassment (p. 10).

Training is often the first exposure many employees get to diversity issues (Wheeler, 1994). Training can be critical to whether an organization will be able to effectively and successfully achieve its diversity goals. Diversity training is frequently referred to as training and education to raise awareness about individual differences and the changes in the workforce and to create the behavior changes that are required to effectively manage and work within a more diverse workforce (Hanover, 1993; Wheeler, 1994). Wheeler conducted a comprehensive study on diversity training and found out that as an increased number of companies accept the concepts of diversity, many are implementing diversity training as a key to and even a primary piece of their diversity initiative. Similarly, Hopkins, Sterkel-Powell, and Hopkins (1994) conducted a study on the preparedness of organizations to manage a diverse workforce. They surveyed 90 companies and found that "training is the key to minimize any disruptions which may be associated with significant increases in workforce diversity" (p. 435).

Many studies show that companies are providing diversity training. A 1991 survey conducted by New York City-based Towers Perrin found that 75% of the companies plan to or currently have diversity training programs in place. Just a year earlier, only 47% of the organizations surveyed expressed an interest in diversity. In 1992, *Training* magazine's annual Industry Report found that 40% of U.S. organizations with 100 plus employees sponsored some kind of diversity training (Rossett & Bickham, 1994). In 1996, this went up to 47% ("Vital Statistics: 1995 Industry Report," 1996).

A survey conducted by Winterle (1992) found that 63% of the 406 responding companies had diversity training for managers, and 39% provided diversity training for employees. When they were asked about future plans to offer diversity training, those numbers rose to 79% for managers and 65% for employees. Morrison (1992) also encountered similar findings that indicated that 65% of major U.S. firms conduct diversity training. In a survey conducted by Harris and Moran (1991), they found that almost two-thirds of the 406 companies participating conducted diversity training for managers. Almost 40% conduct diversity training for all employees. In addition, most indicated that they have future plans to train managers (80%) or their entire workforces (65%).

A survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training (Rynes & Rosen, 1995) found that the majority of the training programs last a day or less and consume less than 10% of the total training budget. They found mixed perceptions on the success of their training programs. The majority of the respondents evaluate participants' reactions but very few conduct long-term evaluations. It was also found that diversity training success is associated with diverse management teams, high priority for diversity issues, top management commitment and support, presence of a diversity manager, mandatory managerial attendance, and long-term evaluations. This study only studied the perceptions of human resource managers and not employees.

In a comprehensive study conducted by Johnson (1995) on the status of valuing and managing diversity in Fortune 500 manufacturing and service organizations, she found that the majority of organizations in both sectors either already had a diversity effort or were in the planning stages (72% in the service sector and 80% in the manufacturing sector). When study participants were asked which development efforts were used to support their organization's diversity efforts, more than 80% reported cultural diversity awareness training (84%), training for managing diversity (83%), and training for valuing diversity (81%) as the most extensively used by their organizations.

Employees in many private companies are also required or encouraged to participate in diversity training. For example, Federal Express strongly recommends that all of their 5,500 managers attend a four-and-a-half-day diversity training program, and Pacific Gas & Electric Company requires a minimum of four hours of diversity training for all of their employees (Rossett & Bickham, 1994).

Many authors believe that evaluation should be conducted as part of an effective diversity training program (Carnevale & Stone, 1995; Cox, 1993; Lublin, 1995; Rynes & Rosen, 1995; Tomervik, 1995). Evaluation provides an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the diversity training that the organization has provided.

Benefits of Diversity Training

If conducted properly, diversity training can bring many effective benefits to the organization and its employees. Simons (1992) noted many possible areas in which substantial gains can be accomplished. These areas can be categorized into three groups. First, the managerial level may get many benefits when there has been effective diversity training in the organization. Managers become more effective because they can provide suitable job assignments and at the same time they can evaluate employees properly. In addition, diversity training can help managers improve recruitment and promotion policies. Managers' jobs are made easier because absenteeism decreases and cooperation increases. Employees may also become more active participants and, therefore, become more efficient and effective work team members. Consequently, through diverse work teams, management gets more new ideas for innovation.

Second, employees also gain benefits. As their motivation and morale increases, employees become more satisfied with their work. They can also have access to better mentoring and coaching. In addition, they are more committed to their professional growth because performance becomes the criterion for success.

Finally, the organization and its environment improve. The workforce becomes more loyal to the organization because employees develop a sense of ownership. At the same time, communication is improved because more information is shared. In addition, the organization is able to save in training costs since greater retention reduces training expenses. The organization's profit will then increase because diversity improves client relations and intensifies customer loyalty due to less conflict. This, in turn, may lead to a decrease in law suits and the environment in general should become safer for workers. In addition to these benefits, Loden and Rosener (1991) have identified that organizations that value diversity will have a competitive advantage at home and abroad. They will be in a better position to cope with change.

In a 1991 survey, Towers Perrin found a growing concern for the diversity issues originally raised in the landmark Hudson Institute study, Workforce 2000. More than half (61%) of the corporate respondents to the Towers Perrin survey acknowledged that workforce programs were implemented in large part because senior management believed that such programs would enhance the organization's competitive position. Similarly, in a 1992 survey of 131 leading organizations in human resource practices, 42% of executives surveyed agreed that learning to capitalize on diversity will increase productivity and competitiveness (Winterle, 1992). The motivation for diversity training is intertwined with the overarching, long-term goals of addressing diversity issues that impact business success. The primary motives for offering diversity training were based upon business needs and the perception that it is a competitive issue (Wheeler, 1994). Diversity initiatives seem to have gained importance and many executives see a connection between diversity management and the bottom line.

Other factors influencing decisions to support workforce-related programs include the need to attract and retain a skilled workforce, the effects of workforce trends on the company, similar actions being taken by each organization's competitors, employee demands, retention and turnover problems, and government mandates or social pressure (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 34). The Society for Human Resource Management and the Commerce Clearing House (SHRM/CCH) (1993) survey, which questioned human resource professionals about a range of diversity-related issues, found that more than 50% of human resource professionals think diversity programs are "socially desirable," and almost 41% believe they would lose some of their best employees if they did not have diversity programs. Diversity training can also help create an environment where all employees perceive that they are valued and can contribute to their full potential.

Types of Diversity Training

There are many kinds of diversity training programs; however, the literature shows that diversity training is often grouped into three types of training and/or phases: (1) awareness-based, (2) skill-based, and (3) integration into other types of training (Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Cox, 1991; Wheeler, 1994). The three different approaches may overlap and can reinforce each other, but are not necessary sequential. All three types of training are described in more detail in this section.

Awareness-Based Diversity Training

Awareness-based programs are among the most popular programs related to diversity training (Carnevale & Stone, 1995; Johnson, 1995; Tomervik, 1994; Wheeler, 1994). Awareness-based diversity training aims at heightening awareness of diversity issues and revealing workers' unexamined assumptions and tendencies to stereotype. Awareness-based training is designed to increase employee knowledge and sensitivity to diversity issues. The major objectives of awareness-based training are to provide information about diversity, heighten awareness and sensitivity through uncovering hidden assumptions and biases, assess attitudes and values, correct myths and stereotypes, and foster individual and group sharing (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 30).

Awareness-based training is designed to promote feelings of unity, tolerance, and acceptance within the existing organizational culture and structure (Martin, 1995). Winterle (1992) stated that awareness-based training frequently includes skills to begin behavior change and centers on creating an understanding of the need for, and meaning of managing and valuing diversity. It is meant to expand participants' self-awareness of diversity-related issues such as stereotyping and crosscultural insensitivity.

Awareness-based diversity training programs differ in emphases. Many training programs of this type attempt to familiarize participants with the demographic trends of the workforce, create an understanding of the benefits of a diverse workforce, reinforce the business impact of diversity, increase awareness of the barriers faced by employees, and demonstrate the organization's commitment to the diversity issue (Hanover, 1993). Some focus on heightening awareness by providing substantive information about the cultures of the various identity groups in the U.S. workplace. Others are process-oriented, aiming at uncovering participants' unconscious cultural assumptions and biases. In addition, many programs focus on creating attitude change around workforce diversity or specific groups of employees. This can take the form of bias-reduction training, which encourages participants to identify and modify negative attitudes toward people from different backgrounds. This often involves surfacing stereotypes of different groups and recognizing prejudice that might typically remain at the subconscious level (Deutsch, 1991; Petrini, 1989). Simons (1992) explained that training programs can help the organizations to become aware of, respect, and value the diversity that exists around it. This type of program involves "awareness of cultural groups (including one's own), their values, behavioral tendencies and lifestyles" (p. 85).

However, awareness-based training in and by itself may not be enough. Awareness is not enough to change behavior; there is a need to develop skills as well: "Usually some blend of awareness training and skills training is desirable so employees can convert understanding into action" (Simons, 1992, p. 80). Awareness-based training is far too "squishy," psychological, and unmeasurable (Geber, 1990). It seeks to heighten awareness, but it does not provide skills to enable participants to act more effectively. Many companies are finding that without skills training in how to deal with cultural differences, employees may be at a loss as to what to do with their new understanding. This is where skill-based diversity training comes in.

Skill-Based Diversity Training

Skill-based diversity training goes beyond consciousness-raising; it provides workers with a set of skills to enable them to deal effectively with workplace diversity. It focuses directly on changing job performance. Programs that have this focus emphasize specific actions that contribute to effectively managing diversity (Hanover, 1993). Skill-based diversity training has three important objectives: (1) building new diversity-interaction skills, (2) reinforcing existing skills, and (3) inventorying skill-building methodologies (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 31).

Skill-based diversity training is in most cases either addressed as a second phase or integrated into other skill-based programs that provide more specific information on cultural norms of different groups and how they may affect work behavior. In addition, it educates employees on specific cultural differences and how to respond to differences in the workplace. This type of training encourages mutual learning, acceptance, and improved understanding between different cultural groups in the organization (Cox & Blake, 1991). Skill-based training provides tools to promote effective interaction in a heterogeneous work setting. The skill-based training may be directed to managers, supervisors, or other types of employees. For example, typical skills taught to employees may include coaching, empowering, giving feedback to diverse individuals, interviewing, mentoring, delegating, and conflict resolution (Carnevale & Stone, 1994; Wheeler, 1994). Simons (1992) noted that skills training requires people to understand the context, content, and use of the skills they learn. Simons also suggested that trainees must have sufficient hands-on practice to be able to utilize and develop the new skills. In effective skills training, trainees learn how to learn. Henderson (1994a) classified skills training into "technical training" specifically

designed for managers and supervisors to develop technical and administrative skills. Its learning process is, therefore, mainly cognitive. This type of training is trainer-subject oriented and has as its principal goal to improve job efficiency.

Integrated-Based Diversity Training

Some companies mainstream their diversity learning objectives into existing training programs. Integration takes place when diversity concepts are implemented into training programs that already exist within the organization such as management development, team building, and leadership training programs (Wheeler, 1994). This requires working with all appropriate groups to make sure the diversity context is integrated into the different programs that the company offers, whether it is sales and service, orientation programs for new recruits, supervisory and management development, or product development (Wheeler, 1994).

Conducting Needs Assessments

Assessment is a tool for diagnosing organizational conditions (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993). According to Leach et al. (1995), "This is the inquiry phase of the diversity initiative, a period of time devoted to asking questions, investigating and seeking information" (p. 25). It is the way of discovering what is the level of awareness, knowledge, and skills trainees have so that the teaching/learning resources and methodology used in the training program are the appropriate ones. Rynes and Rosen (1995) concluded that needs assessment is "one particular useful step toward enhancing the success of diversity training" (p. 268). This process is very important because ethically, training should not be conducted before understanding the issues employees face.

Diversity experts differ as to the specific diversity training required for effective management of diversity. Ideally, companies should conduct a needs assessment to identify the particular diversity needs within the content of their organizational goals. This is particularly important since diversity needs are going to vary greatly among companies. For example, a company in northern Illinois is going to have very different needs than a company in Miami, Tucson, or Los Angeles. This is due to the workforce makeup. Every organization has a culture all its own, shaped by the people who founded it and staff it

(Simons, 1992). Therefore, a critical challenge of diversity training is to understand the organization's needs and to develop objectives which meet those needs.

Wheeler (1994) points out, "Once the organization's diversity needs have been identified, objectives can be set, a strategy put in place, and measures of how well those objectives have been met can be determined" (p. 14). In addition to helping state objectives, needs assessment is a useful tool in prioritizing the dimensions of diversity that are important for the organization to address. This process allows management to target and develop action plans to address diversity issues particularly salient and important not only for the organization, but also to the employees (Sessa, Jackson, & Rapini, 1995).

The process of identifying what the organization's unique needs are and what the cultural climate is are critical steps before developing and implementing training. Thiederman (1991) noted that before spending any money, energy, or time on providing diversity training, it is essential that some of those resources are put into determining the kind of training the organization needs. The needs assessment step is extremely important because it gives the organization the opportunity to carefully assess what type of training is most appropriate for their managers and employees. If organizations do not conduct needs assessment, training may focus on an issue that is not a real problem in the organization (Caudron, 1993), resulting in a waste of resources without achieving changes in behavior.

Despite the importance of conducting needs assessment, many organizations have ignored this process in the development of diversity training. Rynes and Rosen (1995) observed that needs assessment is an area of diversity that has been very much neglected. The common mistake organizations make is to assume what the needs are. Most diversity training seem to have been designed around implicit assumptions rather than explicit demonstration.

Conducting a needs assessment is not always a simple task. The organization must be understood in many dimensions. Moreover, diversity issues are subjective and difficult to measure. Sessa et al. (1995) grouped these issues into two categories: (1) current practices and policies, and (2) current workforce demographics. They advise that before launching any diversity program, it is essential to investigate the organization's current practices and policies. In addition, people in charge of developing diversity training must learn about the nature of diversity in the organization's workforce and how it impacts

attitudes and behaviors (p. 270). Even when the diversity needs assessment is difficult to carry out—because it is time and resources consuming—it is possible to do it. Thiederman (1991) gives the following suggestions to make the task of conducting a needs assessment easier:

- Ask managers, supervisors, native-born workers, and ethnic and immigrant workers how they feel. Do this informally, without duress, and in confidence. Develop written surveys, but be cautious of questions that can distort reality. Personal interviews are safer and more accurate.

- Observe the workplace. Look to see if employees seem to be working well as teams, or is there conflict and controversy. Look to see if the workplace is running efficiently. Watch for problems related to racism, discrimination, misunderstanding, and so forth.

- Study recent discrimination suits, complaints, disciplinary actions, exit interviews, employee assessments and reviews, new hires, promotions, disability claims, and safety records. Look to see what kind of complaints are repeated. Notice if certain cultures or racial groups are involved.

- Invite a diversity consultant to conduct an appraisal. Having someone who is an expert in cultural diversity can be advantageous because such a professional is aware of the kinds of cultural challenges that can arise and is better qualified to identify them. (pp. 170-171)

Simons (1992) pointed out that diversity assessment is critical for the future of organizations and their workforce. He identified nine goals or purposes of diversity assessment:

1. To make clear the importance of, and set priorities for diversity awareness as well as knowledge and skills training at every level of the organization.

2. To help managers as well as internal and external consultants to identify specifically what diversity interventions might be required for the further development of the organization and its personnel.

3. To estimate the size of diversity factors in the organization and their impact on performance.

4. To provide information which will help in the design or acquisition of appropriate diversity programs.

5. To provide an organization with insights into what further assessment might be needed to address the opportunities and challenges created by diversity. To provide rough instruments which could be refined and customized for the organization's specific needs.

6. To provide an assessment of an individual's proficiency and ability to use the competencies appropriate to their function, level, and responsibilities in the organization. Inversely, this tool can be used to suggest the skills needed for a given organizational role.

7. To assess how successful the organization has been at transcultural thinking and behavior.

8. To assist the organization and its leadership to develop a diversity direction, maintain it, and allocate resources to actualize it.

9. To accelerate desirable individual and organizational change through feedback. (pp. 3-4)

Morrison (1992) provided guidelines for organizations to discover their diversity issues. To find relevant information, it is necessary that managers as well as employees be directly involved in the internal investigation. It is important to keep in mind that one of the advantages of needs assessment is to generate commitment through input (Gardenswartz & Rowe, 1993). When employees are directly involved, they are more likely to get involved in the solutions (p. 164). Early involvement from different groups and individuals in the needs assessment data collection process tends to gain more support from throughout the organization for the diversity training strategy.

The needs assessment phase or "inquiry phase" should start with a well-designed plan (Leach et al., 1995). Leaders of the diversity efforts should carefully plan the entire organizational assessment. They should "outline a specific plan of action, including

timetables and roles and responsibilities to be assigned" (p. 24). In the planning of the needs assessment process, the leaders of the diversity initiative have to determine which approach(es) to use, how to develop data-gathering guides, when to conduct it, how to select participants, how to involve the participants, and how to communicate with them. In other words, the process of needs assessment requires clear communication; involvement strategies; and much time, dedication, and effort.

A study conducted by Wheeler (1994) on diversity management found that most participants used a variety of methods and tools to gather needs assessment information. Some assessments are developed in-house, while others are provided by external consultants. Approaches or methods to determine the needs of an organization vary greatly and may include interviews, focus groups, surveys, document reviews, observations, site visits or walk-throughs, benchmarking, and cultural audits.

Interviews are an oral question-and-answer method used to gather data on people's perceptions about the organizational culture and environment. An interview is essentially a conversation and it can be formal or informal. Interviews can be one-on-one or in small groups, and they can be structured, semi-structured, or unstructured. Leach et al. (1995) recommends interviewing the top executive since that individual reflects the cultural root of the organization.

Focus groups are guided discussions used to gather diverse employees' thoughts and perceptions about the organizational culture. Focus groups typically include eight to ten people and can be as small as three or four people. *Surveys* are a systematic method of data collection that explores and evaluates different aspects of the organizational culture. A survey requires respondents to reply in writing. Surveys can be open-ended, closed-ended, or scaled. It is a very useful tool when there are time constraints and/or there are many employees from which to obtain information. A *document review* is another data collection technique in which documents that include data related to employment, salary, attrition, hiring, promotions, complaints, and workforce composition are collected and analyzed.

In *observations*, *site visits*, or *walk-throughs*, the diversity leader observes the climate and culture of the organization. The physical environment, the diversity of the culture, employee interaction, activities, organizational processes, and so forth can be observed during these data collection techniques. These data collection methods are critical

when the diversity leaders are not familiar with the environment or do not have a clear understanding of the organizational culture.

Benchmarking is a comparative investigation in which the diversity leaders study what other organizations have done related to managing diversity (Balm, 1992). The information obtained is then compared to what their organization is doing and changes and adaptations are made as deemed necessary.

The *cultural audit* is an in-depth analysis of the organization to assess its cultural roots. It specifically provides up-to-date and useful information about diversity-related issues (Hayles & Russel, 1997). It is a comprehensive technique which combines interviews, surveys, document reviews, focus groups, and direct observations. Data from managers and employees that relate to, or reflect their attitudes toward, diversity is collected (Thomas, 1991). All approaches already mentioned can be used individually, they can overlap, or be conducted so that a sequence can be developed.

To finish the needs assessment process, it is important to analyze the data gathered. In this phase, the diversity leaders summarize the information collected quantitatively and qualitatively, determine the themes that emerge, and look for commonalties and differences across groups. This process allows them to determine the findings and suggest recommendations to develop an action plan. It is essential, however, that the findings are reported to the ones that provided the information in order to attain their feedback.

Content of Training

Once the needs assessment has been conducted and the objectives have been identified, the next step to consider is what should be included in the diversity training program. Wheeler (1994) recommended asking the following questions when considering what to include in a diversity training program:

- Will the focus be on compliance?
- Is the training session about awareness?
- Is it about race, gender, or age?

- How does diversity link into the business case?
- Is it necessary to link it to the business case?
- What do people know? What don't they know?
- Is the group professional? To whom is it geared, managers or employees, heterogeneous or homogeneous? (p. 21)

Wheeler (1994) conducted a study on diversity training in 45 organizations and found that the most important items of training content included race (94%), gender (89%), stereotypes (89%), ethnicity (89%), business objectives (80%), work-family (71%), age (69%), sexual harassment (67%), national demographics (65%), American Disability Act (ADA) (62%), internal demographics (60%), and sexual orientation (51%) (p. 21). Similarly, Johnson (1995) reported that of the Fortune 500 companies that participated in his study, the greatest percentage of them emphasize race and gender (97%), age (90%), ethnicity (87%), physical disability (87%), religion (70%), language (70%), and sexual orientation (60%) as part of their strategy.

There are commercially available packages in the market that organizations can use to design the content of a diversity training program. Simons (1992) concluded that this may be the easiest way to conduct diversity training. It can also be advantageous because "it may speed up delivery time" (p. 80). However, it may be the least effective because it may not meet the organization's needs. Commercially packaged training programs can be tailored. If they are carefully scrutinized, they can have good results. This approach may be time consuming, however. The training program can be customized by internal trainers, external trainers, or consultants. Or a combination of internal and external trainers can customize the program. Finally, a design team—managers, managers and employees, a cross-section of internal employees, or demographically diverse employees—can plan and implement the training programs.

Simons (1992) recommended first determining what the broad content of the diversity training program should be. The broad content may be for awareness, skills, action planning, organizational change, or a combination. Once the broad content is determined, a more specific content focus may be identified for the diversity training program. The diversity training program, for example, could then be focused on race,

culture, gender, family status, age, or sexual orientation, as well as on other issues. In addition, the diversity training may have a domestic and/or global focus. The diversity training program could also address all these issues combined.

A study conducted by Hopkins et al. (1994) found that, as a whole, organizations give first priority to diversity training programs designed to improve interpersonal skills of managers and employees. Programs aimed at helping employees to understand value and cultural differences were ranked second. Training programs designed to improve technical skills were ranked third. The fourth priority were diversity training programs that intend to indoctrinate employees into the corporate culture.

The Hopkins et al. (1994), study also found that the priority of diversity training depends on the type of employee. For example, diversity training programs for incoming or newly hired employees are ranked in the following order: (1) improving technical skills, (2) improving interpersonal skills, (3) indoctrination into corporate culture, and (4) improving English proficiency. For current employees, diversity training programs are ranked as (1) improving interpersonal skills, (2) indoctrination into the corporate culture, (3) understanding and valuing cultural differences, and (4) improving technical skills. For current managers, the four most valuable programs were ranked as (1) improving interpersonal skills, (2) understanding and valuing cultural differences, (3) training in methods of stress reduction, and (4) employee mentoring. This study found that improving interpersonal skills is the type of training most recommended by human resource directors.

Whoever designs the diversity training programs has to consider potential participants (Simons, 1992). Senior managers, managers, supervisors, other employees, and even suppliers and customers can be incorporated into the training program. The designer should also consider attendance. Simons stated that there are three options: (1) the training program can be required for all employees; (2) it can be required for some employees, while voluntary for others employees; and (3) it can be voluntary for all employees, depending on the needs assessed. The individuals in charge of design should also consider the makeup of the group. Depending on the attendance and content, the training program can be addressed to homogeneous or heterogeneous groups on several dimensions. Typically, "unless the training is targeted to a specific sub-group (e.g., success strategies for women), each session should contain as much participant heterogeneity as possible, especially in terms of gender, race, and culture" (p. 80). This

information can also help in deciding the number of participants per session. The training program may be either highly interactive (15-35 employees); moderately interactive (35 to 50 employees); or it may be handled as a symposium (50 or more attendants). It can also be a large interactive session with multiple trainers (Simons, 1992).

In order to effectively develop or implement a diversity training program, the training strategy should be established and linked with the business and its overall diversity strategy. For example, diversity training must be linked to and support a team-based organizational structure to leverage differences to make teams, and therefore business, more productive. The overall objectives of the diversity training program should be clearly stated and articulated. Employers should not enter into diversity training without having an idea of what they want to accomplish. They need to connect the training to specific business outcome and results such as to enhance team relationships, increase productivity, cut down on turnover, decrease lawsuits, increase sales to diverse markets, and so forth. Without specified objectives, the training efforts are more likely to fail (Wheeler, 1994).

Selecting a Trainer

Selecting a trainer is a very important decision because diversity issues are emotionally volatile, sensitive, and require a person who is well-versed in both the subject matter and the techniques necessary to defuse conflict and reduce resistance (Thiederman, 1991, p. 172). The diversity consultant industry has grown extensively during the past few years. The *ASTD Buyer's Guide and Consultants Directory*, published by the American Society for Training and Development (1996a), provides an indication of how much the field has expanded. In 1996, the guide listed 30 consultants under the category of crosscultural, 80 under diversity training, and 28 under multicultural training. In 1990, there were just 15 consultants listed under all these categories combined. The number of letters and brochures that companies get from diversity consultants is overwhelming: "A director of diversity of a major high technology firm noted that she received approximately 20 letters and solicitations a week from consultants" (Wheeler, 1994, p. 15). The growing number of diversity trainers is evidence of supply and demand at work. More trainers are entering the diversity field because U.S. companies increasingly want to provide that kind of training. Diversity represents one of the few areas of training that is growing during this time of shrinking training budgets (Caudron, 1993).

One of the first decisions leaders of an organization must make is whether an in-house trainer or external consultant will conduct the training. Some training professionals reason that external consultants are more objective, likely to receive more respect and cooperation from employees, and have a broader perspective of what diversity is and how it is being pursued in other companies. Others believe that internal trainers are better at understanding the company's culture and its problems (Caudron, 1993; Thiederman, 1991). When external consultants are selected to provide the training, a thorough review of their credentials should be conducted. Wheeler (1994) concluded that the following characteristics represent those which experts and practitioners believe are important in a good diversity consultant:

Professional Qualifications and Characteristics

- Ability to conduct needs assessments
- Ability to develop programs
- Expertise in particular subject areas
- Credentials
- Good track record/references
- Corporate experience
- Industry knowledge
- Reputation in field
- Knowledge of business terms
- Sound theoretical perspective
- Understanding of components in cultural change (p. 15)

Personal and Interpersonal Skills and Attributes

- Ability to understand cultural differences
- Representative of diversity groups

- Sensitive to individual differences and organizational needs
- Credibility with senior management
- Ability to work collaboratively with corporate team
- Innovative
- Creative
- Good fit with organization
- Inclusive philosophy
- Practical
- Ability to work at different levels throughout the organization (p. 15)

Although there is not one model of what constitutes a good diversity trainer, and no perfect trainer for any organization (Baytos, 1995), there are some important skills and competencies that a good diversity trainer should possess. Wheeler (1994) noted that some of the obvious and more generic competencies are good facilitation skills, knowledge of the subject matter, and ability to engage a group. However, the types of competencies most useful in diversity training are sensitivity, knowledge of self, self-disclosure, candor, ability to respect all cultures, ability to "design on the fly," and maturity (p. 33). Further, Henderson (1994b) noted that trainers should be able to incorporate different learning styles and must understand the dynamics of small group discussion. Simons (1992) pointed out that being able to keep confidentiality is an essential part of professionalism for a diversity trainer. "Professionalism is of the utmost importance for minimizing risks to the organization and participants" (p. 92). Another characteristic that contributes to minimizing risk is the ability of carefully listening to the stakeholders.

Sometimes both external and internal trainers are used depending on the company's programs and needs. Train-the-trainer courses are used by some companies in order to develop internal diversity trainers. Also, whereas external consultants are sometimes used to help in designing diversity programs, internal consultants and employees deliver the programs (Johnson, 1995). According to Wheeler (1994), "[t]raining internal staff as

trainers creates a systematic intervention. Because those trained have contact with human resources, with management and employees, they can have influence every moment of the day with their departments and the organization" (p. 33). Simons (1992) stated that, "it's preferable that the people conducting generic diversity training, whether internals or externals, are themselves diverse and that co-training in diverse pairs (e.g., White female/Latino male or Black female/Asian male) can be especially effective" (p. 80).

The decision to hire an outside consultant or in-house trainer should depend on the specific circumstances of the company. When making the decision, special consideration should be given to the size of the workforce, the complexity of the problems, the receptivity of employees, budgetary restrictions, and the availability of in-house trainers who have the qualifications and capability to conduct effective diversity training (Thiederman, 1991).

Training Methods and Techniques

There are many methods and techniques that are used by companies to deliver diversity training programs. It is important to recognize that not everyone learns at the same pace or the same way, therefore, a variety of approaches to training should be used. Wheeler (1994) documented the following eight training techniques that were effectively used by the participants in his study:

1. *Videos.* Videos come in a variety of forms, cover a wide range of topics, can be affordable, and have potential for reaching a large number of people. Videos that have been identified in the literature as very effective and useful are *Bridging the Talent Gap* by Job Accommodation Network; *Bridges: Skills for Managing a Diverse Workforce* by BNA Communications Inc.; *The Eye of the Storm* by Jane Elliot; and *A Tale of "O"* by Rosabeth Moss-Kanter. The Copeland-Griggs series and the Mosaic Workplace Series tapes are also mentioned as effective training tapes (see p. 79 for a brief description of these and other videos).

2. *Participative Exercises.* Participative exercises may include experiential exercises or simulations, class discussions, and role-playing. Participative activities give the trainees opportunities to interact with the facilitator and other group members.

3. *Case Studies.* Case studies can be most effective when they represent specific organizational circumstances and give the participants the opportunity to analyze a situation and create solutions to real problems. Cases studies that deal with a variety of diversity issues such as gender stereotypes, work-family, discrimination, and aging can be found in many books, handbooks, manuals, and reports.

4. *Lecture.* In most cases, a lecture is a talk delivered in a classroom setting. Lectures can also be delivered by videotape or by teleconference to large groups at different locations. A lecture is mostly one-way communication in which the instructor speaks and trainees listen and are passive recipients of information.

5. *Games.* Games are simulations that are frequently modeled after key aspects of a work setting, in which teams compete while following preestablished rules. Diversity games can be customized and adapted to meet the organization's needs. Games can be entertaining and provide useful information: "The experience gained through the interaction of diversity board games can be as valuable as the knowledge learned" (Gunsch, 1993, p. 81).

6. *Theater.* The use of theater groups in the workplace is a somewhat new concept that seems to have some possibilities for educating people about diversity. An effective theater group needs to tailor its work around the organization it is working with. This means understanding the culture and using language and issues that are specific to the organization. Occasionally, the actors participate or help facilitate the discussion that takes place after the performance. Therefore, the actors should not only understand, but also value diversity and have the ability to relate it to the company's business context.

7. *Handouts.* Handouts are frequently used in training and can be a useful information resource for individuals after training. However, there is no way to guarantee that employees will read or use the handout material, since it requires independent reading and learning.

8. *Audiotapes.* Audiotapes allow employees to listen at their own pace and convenience. This method may be especially useful for commuters or telecommuters. After the audiotapes have been listen to by employees, topics on the tapes can be discussed in groups. (pp. 23-27)

Other frequently used training methods include the following: panels (participants on the panels represent diverse groups who are knowledgeable about the different experiences of individuals in their groups), self-examination (participants take diversity quiz or generate a list of stereotypes and discuss images with a larger group), and personal action plans (participants develop plans to apply on the job what they learned in training) (Rossett & Bickham, 1994).

There are many other methods and techniques that are being used in diversity training. However, an important thing to remember is to utilize a variety of methods and techniques to reach as many people as possible to enhance the learning process related to diversity.

Challenges and Obstacles of Diversity Training

Diversity training presents some challenges and obstacles for companies. Tilove (1991) noted several concerns about the effectiveness of diversity training. For example, some have suggested that diversity programs are designed to intimidate white males into accepting Affirmative Action, that they constitute "brainwashing," and that they provide "meaningless window dressing" without bringing about real change. Mobley and Payne (1992) noted that handling backlash is the biggest challenge facing diversity trainers. Winterle (1992) provided evidence that backlash is a challenge to the full range of diversity activities. She found 61% of respondents feel that fear of backlash from white males is among the three most serious barriers to implementing diversity initiatives. (For more information on backlash, see page 28 of this report.)

The number one barrier to diversity training identified by Wheeler's (1994) study was time. The time element was compounded by the stresses of downsizing, workloads, and competing issues that made it difficult to keep diversity issues in the forefront. Additionally, management and employee resistance was frequently identified as a barrier. Some companies and their employees are resistant to diversity training. Resistance to diversity training usually has to do with fear of change: "Efforts to bring about attitudinal and behavior changes can and often do result in strong resistance from employees" (Henderson, 1994b, p. 26). Henderson identified the following six reasons for this resistance:

1. Resistance to diversity initiatives can be expected if the changes are not clear to the employees.

2. Different people will see different meanings in the proposed changes.

3. Resistance can be expected when employees in supervisory positions are caught between strong forces pushing them to make changes and strong opposing forces pulling them to maintain the status quo.

4. Resistance can be expected to increase to the degree that employees influenced by the changes have pressure put on them to change and it will decrease to the degree that they are actually involved in planning the diversity initiatives.

5. Resistance can be expected if the changes are made on personal grounds rather than impersonal requirements or sanctions.

6. Resistance can be expected if the changes ignore the organizational culture. (Henderson, 1994a, p. 139)

Any diversity training activity may provide a starting point for organizations to begin heightening awareness and sensitivity, and uncovering hidden assumptions and biases. However, diversity training is unlikely to be effective if a company approaches it as a one-time intervention (Carnevale & Stone, 1994). Like all other diversity activities, it needs to be used at appropriate intervals or on an ongoing basis as needed. No one workshop or educational experience will help organizations manage diversity (Carnevale & Stone, 1994). Successful companies view diversity training as a long-term process/strategy, not a program (Caudron, 1993).

Some senior managers hold the belief that costs associated with diversity training outweigh the benefits. Organizations often do not conduct follow-up activities to evaluate the quality of the diversity training programs (SHRM/CCH, 1993). Therefore, changes in behavior, productivity, and work quality resulting from the training cannot be monitored and accurate cost-benefit ratios cannot be determined either (Jackson & Associates, 1992).

Ineffective diversity training by unqualified trainers can cause enormous problems in the workplace. Caudron (1993) provided the following example:

> [T]he manager of a small Midwestern manufacturing company hired diversity consultants to help employees uncover racial tensions in the workplace and learn to deal with them. The consultants split employees into two groups: employees who felt oppressed (minorities) and people who made employees feel oppressed (Caucasian men and women). Employees in the group that felt oppressed shared their resentment and anger toward the Caucasian employees, who listened without responding. This did not bring the groups closer together; the exercise outraged the Caucasian workers. In addition, members of the group that felt oppressed left feeling vulnerable. This drove a wedge between employees, which made working relationships at the company worse than ever. Some other more qualified diversity consultant had to step in to correct the problem. (p. 51)

Ineffective training can hamper or set back an organization's efforts to support diversity (Caudron, 1993).

Mobley and Payne (1992) noted the following mistakes that can occur during diversity training that can create barriers to effective training:

- Trainers use their own psychological issues, such as trust or group affiliation, as templates for training.
- Trainers have political agendas or support particular interest groups.
- Training is not integrated into the organization's overall approach to diversity.
- Training is too brief, too late, or too reactive to a bad situation such as an EEO investigation or a lawsuit.
- Training is presented as remedial and trainees as people with problems.
- Training does not distinguish among the different meanings of valuing diversity, pluralism, EEO, Affirmative Action, and managing across cultures.
- Training does not make the link between stereotyping behavior and personal or organizational effectiveness.
- Training uses a limited definition of whose differences should be valued.
- Training is based on a philosophy of political correctness.

- Training forces people to reveal their feelings about their co-workers or to do exercises that do not respect people's dignity or differences.
- Training does not respect individual styles or participation.
- Training is too shallow or too deep.
- Training pressures only one group to change.
- Resource material contains outdated views.
- Trainers do not model the philosophy or skills associated with valuing diversity.
- Training covers too few issues and does not engage participants individually.
- The curriculum is not adapted to trainees' needs or is not matched to the skills and experience of the trainer.
- Trainers are chosen because they represent or are advocates for a minority group.
- Trainers are not competent at facilitation and presentation, they have poor credibility with trainers, or they are known to be insensitive to diversity issues.
- The discussion of certain issues, such as reverse discrimination, is not allowed. (p. 47)

Karp and Sutton (1994) added some additional concerns and claimed that diversity programs often "miss the mark" for the following reasons:

- Trainers are usually women or ethnic minorities.
- Emphasis is on sensitizing white male managers.
- Programs usually reflect a specific set of values.
- Diversity awareness is the sole theme.
- Programs are frequently guilt-driven.
- Trainers focus on how ideas are communicated rather than what is said or intended.

- Orientation is toward the past and the future—not the present, where the action has to occur. (p. 4)

Diversity training programs need careful planning and special attention. Keeping in mind the challenges and obstacles identified above when developing diversity training strategies should help reduce problems and increase effectiveness (Wheeler, 1994).

Characteristics of an Effective Diversity Training Program

Although diversity training is a fairly new business initiative and its impact has been difficult to measure, there is much information related to what works and what does not work regarding diversity training. Wheeler (1994) identified the following 15 recommendations for creating an effective diversity training initiative:

1. Create a supportive infrastructure. The commitment of senior leadership, a process of ongoing accountability, and a commitment to communicating change are critical to a supportive infrastructure.

2. Provide clear communication about training. Start with strong communication before training to articulate why diversity is an issue and why diversity training is being offered. Let employees know why they are being trained.

3. Create "inclusive" programs by keeping definitions broad. Definitions of diversity should extend beyond race and gender and should not exclude any individual or group.

4. Create flexibility and tailor programs to internal needs. Internal demographics, work situations, and scenarios are most useful for tailoring the program to specific audience needs.

5. Conduct train-the trainer courses. Train-the-trainer courses can help establish change agents among various businesses, divisions, and departments.

6. Include senior management in training and require attendance. Managers should be trained first so that they have a clear understanding of diversity and what their

expectations and goals should be. Preceding diversity training with communication from management on the importance of diversity to the business is very important.

7. Enroll all employees. It is important that everyone hears the same message and is involved in helping to move the initiative forward.

8. Train business units together. When a business unit trains together, the members of the team return to their work with common knowledge, understanding, expectations, and a better understanding of each other.

9. Provide trust and confidentiality. An environment of trust and confidentiality is critical and must be established upfront at all training sessions.

10. Set clear training session ground rules. Provide a set of ground rules or allow trainees to set their own. Ground rules may include such things as being on time, respecting other people's opinions, and keeping all classroom discussion confidential.

11. Co-facilitate sessions. Sometimes insider knowledge combined with external expertise can be very effective. A diversity of facilitators by race, gender, expertise, and experience is also recommended.

12. Ensure diverse attendance. In addition to training work groups or teams, trainees should represent various races and genders as well as physical differences, levels within the organization, functions, and other differences.

13. Establish action plans. Action plans help to ensure that trainees carry their learning into the workplace, applying the new principles and consequently helping to lead the organization to institutional change.

14. Provide and ensure follow-up. Action plans need follow-up. Follow-up helps create accountability.

15. Create accountability. The most prevalent or recommended way of creating accountability is to incorporate diversity objectives into employee and management assessments and to link those objectives with reward and recognition programs. (pp. 39-40)

Diversity education and training is most effective when it is articulated with all education and training systems within the organization and delivered to all employees including the CEO and entry-level employees. Diversity training is most effective when it is designed, developed, and revised according to specific organizational needs (Tomervik, 1995).

To make diversity training work efficiently and effectively, it must be combined with other diversity initiatives. Some organizations have attempted to connect their diversity strategies to organizational needs and business objectives. A long-term perspective and integration with other organizational efforts, such as continuous quality improvement, are needed to ensure that diversity efforts are most effective (Johnson, 1995). Carnevale and Stone (1994) recommended that diversity initiatives should not be isolated from other business practices: "Diversity initiatives work best when they are integrated into a larger system of business practices. In fact, diversity initiatives have close ties to other processes—total quality management, team building, reengineering, and employee empowerment" (p. 39). More organizations are making connections between diversity and other business approaches in order to become more competitive (Fernandez, 1993).

To have better results, diversity initiatives need to be included as part of the organizational strategic plan (Fernandez, 1993). Gardenswartz and Rowe (1993) noted that diversity training is only one part of an organization's comprehensive diversity strategy and cannot stand alone. As part of an overall process, diversity training can help move an organization forward by maximizing the potential of all employees in an increasingly diverse and global marketplace. Tomervik (1994) believed that there is no one diversity plan that is appropriate for all organizations. Strategies need to be implemented based on the unique characteristics of the organization. Organizational needs must be reassessed frequently. Diversity, by its nature, requires self-reflection—organizationally and individually (Tomervik, 1994).

Diversity training is unlikely to be effective when companies approach it as a one-time effort. Like other diversity initiatives, it needs to be provided on a continual and appropriate-times basis. Also, organizations need to evaluate the effectiveness of the diversity training programs. This means devising tools and methods to monitor changes in behaviors that result from training (Carnevale & Stone, 1995). Baytos (1995) summarized the required strategies needed to impact diversity education and training: position training as

part of a total diversity strategy, start with a thorough needs analysis, measure effects, use a participative design process, incorporate quality control in selecting trainers, and incorporate quality control in planning the logistical aspects of training.

Evaluation of Diversity Training

There are many reasons to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of diversity initiatives. Two of the main reasons to evaluate a diversity training program are (1) to measure the nature and scope of return on investment to match the cost involved in the training with the related benefits, and (2) to compare the situation before and after the training, to see if the training objectives were achieved (Casse, 1981). Similarly, Pedersen (1994) stated that evaluation is valuable for the trainees in giving feedback on their accomplishments, and it is also valuable for trainers in that it demonstrates the strengths or weaknesses of the design, which can be used to make improvements.

Diversity training outcomes should be emphasized because if they are not measured, it is possible that "well-intentioned diversity efforts can cost an organization a great deal of time and money and yet not create any significant, lasting change" (Morrison, 1992, p. 230). Rynes and Rosen (1995) stated that two main reasons to evaluate diversity training are (1) cost and (2) possible neutral or negative outcomes. According to these authors, without concrete information about a program's strengths, weaknesses, and impacts, it is impossible to improve content and delivery. They also added that "lack of evaluation signals low responsiveness to attendees and low commitment to follow-up or [improvement of] program outcomes" (p. 253). Evaluation is also a way to fight against critics (Jackson & Associates, 1992), and its results may provide support for continuing with diversity programs (Lublin, 1995). The principal objective for following up diversity training is to establish accountability (Cox, 1993).

Rynes and Rosen (1995) suggested that it is very important to conduct formative evaluations. These during-training evaluations improve the training that is currently in practice. They also advocated for summative evaluations. This means that trainees should have a post-training or on-the-job evaluation to measure if the transfer has occurred. Standards of measure of productivity and profitability are sometimes used in organizations

to show that diversity is good for business (Morrison, 1992, p. 235). However, it is very difficult to prove that diversity training is affecting organizations positively or negatively.

Limitations

Some companies do not measure the impact and effectiveness of diversity training because it is too problematic (Cox, 1993; Wheeler, 1994). Some of these companies do not evaluate diversity training because there are no measurements in place, there is a lack of clear objectives, it is too early in the training process, or just because the company is doing well financially and therefore there is no need for assessment. Some company managers also believe that there are too many variables affecting productivity measures to isolate a direct cause-effect relationship. Others believe that most diversity training programs are so new that it is too soon to judge how effective they are.

Organizations have many reasons for not evaluating: "Foremost is the fact that profits are influenced by so many factors that it is difficult to isolate the specific causes of profit level" (Cox, 1993, p. 240). When "evaluating individual practices, there is a risk that their true contribution will be over or under estimated because the effects of other practices and other factors that determine outcomes" (Morrison, 1992, p. 243). Moreover, diversity training results may not be identifiable as an organization outcome for many years. Another reason is that there are no well-developed measures to diversity. Suspicious negative results and slow change expectancy are reasons for not investing time and resources to monitor diversity initiatives (Jackson & Associates, 1992).

Tomervik (1995) conducted a study on workforce diversity in 26 Fortune 500 companies headquartered in Minnesota. She found that corporate representatives who lead the diversity process within their organizations lack a clearly focused diversity evaluation plan that could provide valid, reliable results on current diversity efforts. Furthermore, she concluded that even corporations with leading-edge human resource policies and practices find it difficult to define and specify appropriate evaluation methods and measures.

For many corporations, Tomervik (1995) noted, the evaluation of the diversity process continues to be a difficult problem. The diversity process is constantly changing within organizations based on the interest, needs, and demands of the diverse workforce. In each corporation, the diversity goals are established and revised based on the influence

of numerous organizational characteristics, including climate, culture, history, leadership, workforce demography, and financial stability. In most instances the end goal for organizations pursuing a diversity agenda is time-bound and context-bound—changing with the economic, political, and social climate of the times (p. 137).

A study on diversity training conducted by SHRM/CCH (1993) found that only 30% of its respondents who conducted diversity training go on to measure results related to work behavior and productivity. Evaluating diversity training programs is a challenging task. It appears that few organizations use tools to measure diversity performance or to link such performance with individual accountability (Carnevale & Stone, 1994).

In spite of the increase in research in this area of diversity in the workforce, not much has been done empirically or conceptually to explain the ways in which workforce diversity provides positive benefits to organizations (Washington, 1995). There have only been a few empirical evaluations of the results of diversity training. Despite the importance of evaluation, research in this area is very limited (Hanover, 1993; Rynes & Rosen, 1995; Tomervik, 1994).

Some studies have shown the effects of diversity training. For example, Dunnette and Motowidlo (1982) examined the impact of training programs designed to reduce sexist attitudes and obvious behavioral displays of these attitudes in an organization. They found that while some women may return to their work settings and be more assertive, more candid, and more supportive, the training program had little measurable impact overall on the behaviors or attitudes of men or women.

An index of perceptions about the effectiveness of diversity training programs was presented by the SHRM/CCM (1993) survey: about 3% of respondents whose companies used such programs found them to be extremely successful; almost 30% found them to be quite successful; about 50% said the programs at their companies were neutral; about 13% called them largely unsuccessful; and 5% called them extremely unsuccessful. Wheeler (1994) added, "The large 50 percent neutral response may indicate that it is too early to measure the success of training for those companies which have implemented diversity training. The number may also reflect companies not having assessed their programs or not putting specific measures in place" (p. 37).

While some companies report that diversity training has reduced attrition and increased the promotion rates of women and people of color, only a few isolated attempts have been made to empirically evaluate diversity training to date. Adler (1991) found that people who obtained a basic understanding of cultural diversity through diversity training were more likely to recognize its impact on work behavior and to identify potential advantages of diversity. Cox (1991) reported that the "Race Relations Competence Workshop" programs developed by Clay Alderfer and Robert Tucker have resulted in more positive attitudes toward African Americans and inter-race relations among participants.

Some companies have linked diversity training to increased productivity. However, there is little evidence that these statements are based on objectively measured bottom line results rather than opinions and intuitive judgments. Very little research has been conducted to date examining the factors relating diversity training to performance (Johnson, 1995; Triandis & Bhawuk, 1994).

Techniques and Procedures

In spite of the difficulties of assessing the impact of diversity training, many companies have attempted to measure the effects of diversity training on employees and organizations using such standard measures as the following:

- Written course evaluations
- Focus groups
- Electronic mail discussion
- Monitoring of formal grievances
- Discussion with participants at the end of the session
- Vendor questionnaires (Wheeler, 1994, p. 35)

Similarly, Tomervik (1995) found that the two diversity evaluation measures most frequently utilized by corporations with diversity efforts were data from employee surveys and traditional Affirmative Action numbers. Four other evaluation methods or measures

used to monitor diversity progress within corporations were (1) focus groups, (2) turnover rates, (3) hiring numbers, and (4) listening to employees.

A study conducted by Johnson (1995) found that the performance measures organizations most often used to monitor or evaluate diversity efforts were increased diversity at all management levels, increased diversity at the middle-management level, increased diversity at the top-management level, increased employee satisfaction, increased employee knowledge of diversity, a decrease in employee turnover rate, and an increase in profit/productivity. Evaluation methods used included surveys, training evaluations, statistical analysis, measurable calendar of objectives, targeted MBOs (Management by Objectives), attendance at programs, and discussion. Of these evaluation methods, surveys and training evaluations were most used by participating organizations (p. 11).

Diversity training can be approached from different evaluation perspectives. Considering its purpose, a diversity training program should have formative and summative evaluations. Formative evaluation in this case refers to the measurement of short-term effects. This is considered essential because it can provide feedback on what needs improvement or adjustments to effectively fulfill the organization and employees' needs. Summative evaluations should also be conducted. These are long-term evaluations designed to verify whether long-term needs of the groups were met. Rynes and Rosen's (1995) study showed that more successful training programs are associated with long-term follow-up evaluations of training.

Another approach to evaluate diversity training is by objectives. This type of evaluation is designed to verify whether the objectives of the training were achieved (Casse, 1981). It is also used to see if trainees met the objectives of awareness, knowledge, or skill of the diversity programs (Pedersen, 1994).

The Kirkpatrick (1994) evaluation model of training can be used—and is advisable to use—to evaluate diversity training. It is also possible to evaluate the short- and long-term effects of diversity training, according to Keller, Young, and Riley (1996). Following the Kirkpatrick approach to training evaluation, these authors provide evaluation instruments to measure participants' reactions, learning outcomes, transfer of learning, and organizational results. However, due to its complexity, they did not discuss how to evaluate return on investment.

Some authors have made some recommendations for conducting effective diversity-training evaluations. A clearly focused evaluation plan which includes accountability and rewards for progress is a necessity. This is needed in order to create an environment where diversity can flourish (Tomervik, 1995). When evaluating diversity training, it is important to keep in mind that its success will be not only influenced by factors associated with the training itself, but also by factors associated with a supportive environment for training (Rynes & Rosen, 1995). In addition, Jackson and Associates (1992) suggest collecting relevant evaluation data and making sure that the types of evaluation data collected are consistent with the intended objectives of the diversity initiatives.

FUTURE TRENDS

The literature indicated that the U.S. population will continue to become more diverse. U.S. companies will continue to expand through acquisitions, mergers, and the transfer of facilities overseas and will be faced with increasing diversity in the workforce (Fernandez, 1993; Thomas, 1996). As the world competition increases and the U.S. competes in the global marketplace, diverse work teams will be a reality:

> The key strategy to deal with the complex issue of forming high-performance, decisive, quality-oriented work teams is for corporations to understand the crucial link among diversity, team building, and total quality management. Unless people understand and value one another organizations cannot develop trust, which is the key to effective work teams. And without effective work teams, U.S. corporations will not become world-class, competitive organizations that produce quality products and services. (Fernandez, 1993, p. 285)

Nelton (1995) noted that having a diverse workforce and managing it effectively will be good business in the future. Diversity training will have to continue so as to prepare managers for a more diverse workforce. Nelton described six characteristics that successful managers will have in the future. First, they have to be multilingual. They will have to at least understand other languages to "feel comfortable around other people who do not speak English" (p. 27). Second, they will have to be well-traveled. It means that they will have to interact with other cultures by going to other countries. Third, they will have to be well-read. This means that managers will have to read information not only about their culture, but also other cultures. Fourth, managers will have to feel comfortable crossing

cultural lines. This means that they will establish relationships with individuals outside their own culture. Fifth, they will have to be open-minded. Morrison (1992) defined open-mindedness as the willingness to do things that have never been done before. Finally, managers will have to demonstrate commitment and fairness to employees. They will have to give the same opportunities for all employees. Thomas (1992) believed that effective implementation of managing diversity in the future will make Affirmative Action unnecessary. Thomas warns, however, that given the magnitude of the change required, for most organizations, institutionalization of managing diversity as a way of life will require a long-term perspective.

In addition, Loden and Rosener (1991) stated that new attitudes will be required from managers to deal with diversity in the future. Managers will need to recognize cultural diversity, learn to value and respect fundamental differences, and find common ground on which to build relationships of trust and mutual respect with diverse employees (p. 223). Similarly, Melkonian (1995) indicated that in the future "to thrive and advance as a professional, individuals will have to effectively communicate with people cross-culturally, among races, between genders, and across subtle barriers of deeply rooted individual values. They will be an integral part of an evolutionary journey toward a new multiculturalism" (p. 37).

As demographic changes will bring more and more diversity, many problems will remain. More training professionals will face the challenge of dealing with backlash (Mobley & Payne, 1992). Sims and Sims (1993) forecasted that organizations and their training staff will be confronted with finding ways to stem the tide of increased training costs. To measure the effectiveness of training programs and techniques, organizations will continue to strive to obtain hard and soft data. Organizations already committed to diversity will strive with new difficulties. Organizations will have to respond to the different learning needs and styles that a diverse workforce requires: "The future challenge on the differences in learning styles must be addressed as a key to successful diversity and difference training while recognizing yet another example of the differences that exist among us" (p. 87).

Wheeler's (1994) perception is that diversity itself is evolving and is unlikely to be a passing fad. According to Wheeler, diversity is "likely to develop into a more integrated strategy that incorporates the basic elements and tenets of diversity into traditionally established, standard training curricula such as management development and orientation

programs" (p. 41). He thinks that "in addition to becoming more integrated, the emphasis of programs is likely to change, or incorporate more issues" (p. 41). Furthermore, Wheeler explains, future training is likely to incorporate work-family issues and be more focused on productivity and competitive business needs than on valuing of differences. Diversity training will continue to be an essential diversity strategy to help organizations maximize the full potential of all employees in an increasingly diverse and global marketplace. According to Fernandez (1993), managing diversity needs to be a corporate strategy that is directly tied into the business strategic plan for managing organizational change and improving productivity now and in the future.

CONCLUSIONS

There are numerous ways in which diversity has been defined. They range from very narrow definition to very broad. In the broadest sense, diversity is all-inclusive and recognizes everyone. However, there is no definition that fully includes all the characteristics that a diverse population may bring to the workplace.

There are many forces that are driving diversity issues in organizations. There is a significant increase in women and minority populations in the workplace. Americans continue to mature. An increasing number of minority youths; gay men, lesbians, and bisexual individuals; and people with disabilities are entering the labor force. More businesses are becoming global, and there is an emphasis on teamwork.

The demographic composition is affecting not only the makeup of the workforce but also the makeup of the marketplace. Therefore, having a diverse workforce and managing it properly is perceived as a competitive strategy that can not only help attract diverse customers but also people who have different perspectives which contribute to the creativity of the organization.

Many fields have been considered diversity pioneers. International business is one of them. The success of international business highly depends on the effective implementation of diversity initiatives. Diplomacy also requires valuing diversity. Voluntary associations serving overseas are also organizations who have to learn to value

diversity to be successful. Some athletic teams have also overcome their differences to achieve common objectives. Disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, history, linguistics, philosophy, ethics, social work, and psychology attempt to understand diversity. In addition, many businesses have started to understanding the value of diversity.

Different researchers have found a multitude of reasons for implementing diversity initiatives in organizations. Many of them agree that the main reason is to improve corporate productivity and profitability. There is also a considerable amount of research done regarding the outcomes of heterogeneous groups. There is research evidence that diverse work teams outperform homogenous groups.

Managing diversity is not easy. It can encounter many barriers. Some of the most common barriers include stereotype and prejudice, discrimination, harassment, difficulty balancing work and family, poor career planning and development, lack of organizational political savvy, unsupportive work environment, exclusion and isolation, qualifications and performance questioned, lack of mentors, and backlash.

There is a wide range of initiatives for managing diversity in the workplace. However, no single initiative is comprehensive enough to solve all diversity issues or to successfully manage diversity in organizations. Diversity training is one of the primary and most widely used initiatives to address diversity issues in organizations. Needs assessment and evaluation are essential elements in the process of developing diversity training programs. However, the qualifications of a diversity trainer are fundamental to making diversity training successful. Because of the role diversity training plays in organizations, diversity training should be an integral part of all human resource and management development.

In the future, diversity issues will continue at the forefront because the population will become even more diverse and more companies will become global. As diversity is becoming more complex, diversity training will continue to be an essential element of the overall diversity strategy.

GLOSSARY

Affirmative Action: Legally mandated programs whose aim is to increase the employment opportunities of groups who have been disadvantaged in the past (Simons, Vasquez, & Harris, 1993, p. 239).

African American: Relating to the black persons of America whose ancestry derive from Africa. Does not traditionally include white South African descendants and descendants of Arabs from Northern African nations such as Libya and Tunisia. Persons having similar experiences, cultural heritage, and ancestry of former slaves in the United States (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Asian American: Relates to first generation and beyond Americans whose ancestors derive from Asia (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Assumptions: Taking things for granted about others. Something accepted or supposed true without proof or demonstration (Simons et al., 1993, p. 239).

Awareness: Bringing to one's own conscious mind that which is only unconsciously perceived; for example, becoming conscious of the real differences among people and a sense that these differences may have to do with how people are or should be treated by others (Simons et al., 1993, p. 239).

Backlash: Negative reactions to the development of power by women and minorities can be characterized as a form of backlash. This may be called diversity backlash when applied to organizations. This type occurs when minority members are perceived as attempting to develop power by individual or collective means. Diversity backlash can be characterized as a preemptive strike against the development of power of groups lacking power in organizations. Typically, it occurs before power has actually been obtained by minority groups; it is a reaction to the threat of loss of power by the majority group (Chemers et al., 1995, p. 106).

Bias: Preference or an inclination to make certain choices, which may be positive (bias towards excellence) or negative (bias against people), often with a resultant unfairness to someone (Simons et al., 1993, p. 240).

Blacks: See African American.

Class: Level of economic status; members of similar status possess similar cultural, political, and economic characteristics and principles (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Crosscultural: Involving or mediating between two cultures—one's own and that of another (Simons et al., 1993, p. 240).

Culture: The organization of beliefs, languages, habits, and traditions of a civil society that is socially transmitted (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Cultural Values: An integrated system of rules, regulations, behaviors, and ways of communicating for a specific group of people. A set of norms that define a feeling of differentiating "us" from "them (Simons et al., 1993, p. 240).

Disability: Any condition which results in functional limitations that interfere with an individual's ability to perform his or her customary work (Akabas, Gates, & Galvin, 1992, p. 3).

Disadvantaged: Having less than sufficient resources to fund all of basic needs; without expendable income. A group that severely lacks economic and social resources (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Discrimination: To prejudge, differentiate; often cause for many court cases about violation of civil rights in workplace and housing (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Diversity: Diversity refers to the presence of differing cultures, languages, ethnicities, races, sexual orientations, religious sects, abilities, classes, ages, and national origins of the peoples in an institution or community such as a school, workplace, neighborhood, and so on (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Diversity Training: Diversity training is frequently referred to as training and education to raise awareness about individual differences and the changes in the workforce and to

create behavior changes that are required to effectively manage and work within a more diverse workforce (Hanover, 1993; Wheeler, 1994).

Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO): Legally mandated guidelines whose objective is to guarantee that all people, whatever their background, are treated equally and fairly in such matters as pay, promotion, dismissal, and so on (Simons et al., 1993, p. 241).

Ethnicity: Belonging to a religious, racial, national, or cultural group; may be a subgroup of a larger group—for example, Jews, Caribbean Americans, Koreans (University of Maryland Diversity Database. 1996).

Gay: Male who is attracted to other males (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Gender: Sexual classification; defined as male, female, or neutral (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Globalization: The internationalizing of a country, group, business, or social structure through the mixture of peoples or technology (Simons et al., 1993, p. 242).

Harassment: A course of conduct directed at a specific person that causes substantial emotional distress in such a person and serves no legitimate purpose. The term is used in a variety of legal contexts to describe words, gestures, and actions which tend to annoy, alarm, and abuse (verbally) another person; for example, the use of obscene or profane language or the natural consequence of which is to abuse the hearer or reader and is unlawful harassment under the Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. 15. U.S.C.A. sec. 1692 (d) (2) (Black, 1990, p. 717).

Hispanics: This term is often used to refer collectively to all Spanish speakers (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Immigrant: A person who resides in a country other than that of his or her origin. Also called nonnative, outlander, outsider, alien (antecedent: emigrant) (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Latino: This term is used to refer to people originating from, or having a heritage related to, Latin America, in recognition of the fact that this set of people is actually a superset of many nationalities. Since the term *Latin* comes into use as the least common denominator for all peoples of Latin America. In recognition of the fact that some romance language (Spanish, Portuguese, French) is the native tongue of the majority of Latin Americans, this term is widely accepted by most. However, the term is not appropriate for the millions of native Americans who inhabit the region (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Lesbian: Woman who is attracted to other women (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Managing Diversity: To manage diversity is to empower or enable employees. Managing diversity prescribes approaches that are philosophically broad enough to encompass all dimensions of diversity. Managing diversity also emphasizes the managerial skills and policies needed to optimize and emphasize every employee's contribution to the organizational goals (Henderson, 1994a, p. 8; Thomas, 1992, p. 315).

Minorities: The term *minority* is used to describe groups of race or ethnicities that represent a small percentage of the overall population of a nation/state/continent (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

People of Color: The term *people of color* is used by multiculturalists and educators to define *minority individuals*. Other people are less likely to use this term (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Prejudice: Exerting bias and bigotry based on preconceptions (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Race: Classification of people based on common nationality, history, or experiences (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Racism: The act of one in power exerting biased and prejudiced behavior over another. The notion that one's race is superior over another race (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Racist: A person with a closed mind toward accepting one or more groups different than one's own origin in race or color (Simons et al., 1993, p. 242).

Sexual Harassment: Sexual harassment is as a type of employment discrimination, which includes sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature prohibited by federal law (Black, 1990, p. 1375).

Stereotypes: To categorize ideas, people, or objects based on a typecast or standardized prototype, lacking any room to account for individuality (University of Maryland Diversity Database, 1996).

Transcultural: Grounded in one's own culture but having the culture-general and culture-specific skills to be able to live, interact, and work effectively in a multicultural environment (Simons et al., 1993, p. 245).

Values: Set of internal instructions based in culture and personal experience, which determine acceptable behavior for a group or individual. Such cultural priorities can be expressed in terms of moral, family, organizational, or even national values—namely, what a group considers important or desired behaviors for its members (Simons et al., 1993, p. 245).

Valuing Diversity: Valuing diversity means being responsive to a wide range of people unlike oneself, according to any number of distinctions: race, gender, class, native language, national origin, physical ability, age, sexual orientation, religion, professional experience, personal preferences, and work style (Carnevale & Stone, 1994, p. 24).

Reverse Discrimination: This is a relatively new concept. It is a claim used to characterize any preference for others over those in the dominant group. This claim has been used frequently to oppose Affirmative Action and support dissent and resistance to change within many mainstreams in the organizational culture (Loden & Rosener, 1991, p. 128).

Working with Diversity: *Working with diversity* is a term that is sometimes used in the place of managing diversity. Working with diversity calls forth the challenge to be curious, inquire, interact, reflect, and experiment. It requires individuals to be respectful, curious, patient, and willing to learn (Leach et al., 1995, p. 3).

RESOURCE LIST OF VIDEOS

A Class Divided. Frontline Series. This program can be obtained from University of Minnesota, University Film & Video, Continuing Education and Extension, 1313 Fifth Street S.E., Suite 108. Minneapolis, MN 55414; (800) 847-8251. This program updates the original Frontline documentary *Eye of the Storm* through a reunion of the former third-graders and their teacher fifteen years later. The students, now young adults, relate the profound and enduring effects of their discrimination lesson on their lives and in their early experiences as parents. (color, 55 min., c1986)

A Tale of "O" by Rosabeth Moss-Kanter. Good Measure, Inc., P.O. Box 3004, Cambridge, MA 02139. This film/video shows how a few "O"s learn to function as "X"s.

Bill Cosby on Prejudice. Budget Films, 4590 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90029; (213) 660-0187. This film presents a monologue by Bill Cosby on prejudice.

Born Free. Educational Equity Act Publishing Center, 55 Chapel Street, Suite 231, Newton, MA 02160. These three half-hour videos feature panel discussions and interviews dealing with sex-role stereotyping.

Bridges: Skills for Managing a Diverse Workforce. (1991). BNA Communications Inc., 9439 Key West Avenue, Rockville, MD 20850; (800) 233-6067, fax: (301) 948-2085. BRIDGES is an eight-module video-based training program covering different issues of diversity (e.g., giving feedback, overcoming stereotypes, building teams, and resolving intercultural conflicts).

Bridging Cultural Barriers: Managing Ethnic Diversity in the Workplace. Barr Films, 12801 Schabarum Avenue, P.O. Box 7878, Irwindale, CA 91706-7878; (800) 234-7878. This half-hour film featuring Sondra Thiederman, Ph. D., teaches about the effective management of diverse workers through a simulated example of a manager resolving situations with two culturally different staff members.

Bridging the Talent Gap. Job Accommodation Network, West Virginia University, 809 Allen Hall, P.O. Box 6122, Morgantown, WV 26506-6122; outside WV, (800) 526-7234; all lines voice and TDD. 29-minute video for viewers with impaired hearing. $25.

Eye of the Storm by Jane Elliot. Frontline Series. This program can be obtained from University of Minnesota, University Film & Video. Continuing Education and Extension, 1313 Fifth Street, S.E., Suite 108, Minneapolis, MN 55414; (800) 847-8251. During a National Brotherhood Week, an imaginative teacher involves her third-grade students in an experience designed to show the anatomy of prejudice. The children were identified as either brown- or blue-eyed, and were physically separated on that basis. On another day, the roles were reversed. The isolated, separated groups learned how it would be to be judged by color of their eyes. (color, 27 min., c1970)

Faces. Salinger Films, 1635 12th Street, Santa Monica, CA 90404; (310) 450-1300. This one-minute, non-narrated video shows a kaleidoscope of human faces of different sexes, races, and ages merging and complementing each other to form an integrative whole. By showing the individual worth of each face as well as its contribution to the total picture, the video demonstrates that we are all unique, yet we share a common bond.

Living and Working in America. Via Press, Inc., 400 E. Evergreen Boulevard, Suite 314, Vancouver, WA 98660; (800) 944-8421. A comprehensive three-volume audiovisual series for training non-native speakers of English in communication skills needed for supervisory/management positions in the multicultural workforce. Includes video scenes, textbook, audiotapes, and an instructor manual with experiential learning activities.

Managing Diversity. CRM Films, 2233 Faraday Avenue, Carlsbad, CA 92008; (800) 421-0833. This film combines dramatizations of information from experts in the field to focus on diversity issues such as stereotyping and communication as well as differences in perceptions regarding teamwork, power, and authority. It ends with a list of useful things people can do to improve communication in a diverse work environment. A guide is included.

The Americans with Disabilities Act: New Access to the Workplace. Coronet/MTI Film & Video; (800) 621-2131. 39-minute video with leader's guide and participant's workbook. ($595; rental, $125)

Managing a Multicultural Workforce: The Mosaic Workplace Series. Films for the Humanities and Sciences, P.O. Box 2053, Princeton, NJ 08543-2053; (800) 257-5126. This is a series of videos addressing the issues of the diverse workplace. It covers topics such as understanding different cultural values and styles, men and women working together, and success strategies for minorities. Some of them are listed below:

Managing Diversity. Opens with a furry picture; but before viewers can adjust the image, the point has been made: Managers of an increasingly diverse workforce need to have a clear picture of what is really going on. The program points out the six major challenges managers face in developing a clear and unbiased picture, and helps viewers hone their techniques to achieve this goal. (color, 14 min., c1990)

Race & Sex Discrimination in the Workplace: What You Need to Know. Emphasizes the organization's responsibility for creating a work environment that allows equal access to employment opportunities. Includes interviews with legal experts, individuals who have filed discrimination suits, and with a EEOC Vice Commissioner. Examines the hiring and promotion practices of a company known for its fair employment practices. (color, 21 min., c1990)

Recruitment and Job Interviews. The realities of today's workplace indicate that there are not enough qualified employees, and there are not enough minority employees who will "fit in" or have the proper skills. This program shows how good recruitment efforts and effective, nonbiased job interviews can find and select the best employees. (color, 18 min., c1990)

The Multicultural Workplace. Demonstrates the importance of valuing cultural diversity in the workplace. Uses vignettes of supervisory-level interactions to illustrate the misunderstandings and cultural assumptions at work. Stresses that tapping into cultural diversity can improve communication, build unity and morale, and increase productivity. (color, 30 min., c1990)

Women in the Workplace: Changing Roles. Explores the issues raised by the changing roles of women in the workplace—for example, the legal aspects of discrimination based on sex, and the more common issues of confusion, resentment, and lack of cooperation and emotional support engendered by the change in the traditional roles of men and women in the workplace. (color, 16 min., c1990)

Partners in Change. American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), Program Resources Department, P. O. Box 51040, Washington, DC 22091. This 17-minute video demonstrates how a business can benefit from hiring the mature woman. It discusses the skills that displaced homemakers can transfer to a job as well as the commitment and stability they can bring to an organization.

Sandcastle: A Film about Teamwork and Diversity. Salinger Films, 1635 12th Street, Santa Monica, CA 90404; (310) 450-1300. Teamwork and the unique contribution of each diverse team member is illustrated in this Academy Award-winning, non-narrated 13-minute video. In this unique story about the building of a sandcastle, the film demonstrates the value of diversity.

Serving the Diverse Customer. Salinger Films, 1635 12th Street, Santa Monica, CA 90404; (310) 450-1300. This video helps customer service staff understand the dynamics of crosscultural communication and get beyond the barriers to establish positive relationships with diverse customers. Vignettes of typical customer/staff interactions are shown, and tips for providing top-notch service to a diverse population are given.

Valuing Diversity Series. Contact Copeland Griggs Productions, Inc., 302 23rd Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94121; (415) 668-4200, fax: (415) 668-6004. This seven-part film/video series for managers and other employees focuses on the advantages inherent in diversity. Segments deal with issues such as managing/supervising differences, upward mobility in a multicultural organizations, and communicating across cultures. The series includes a user's guide. The following is a list of the segments:

Managing Differences, Part 1. Shows how to evaluate, develop, and motivate diverse employees. Dramas and interviews illustrate how assumptions, real differences, and organizational culture affect the performance of managers, supervisors, and administrators in multicultural settings. (color, 30 min., c1986)

Diversity At Work, Part 2. Informs employees how to succeed in the multicultural organization. Dramatic illustrations show how stereotypes and actual differences affect the employees' ability to succeed. Diverse individuals present strategies for employee self-development, teamwork, and relationship-building with supervisors and peers who are different from themselves. (color, 30 min., c1986)

Communicating Across Cultures, Part 3. Illustrates how misunderstandings result from different styles of communication. Addresses the discomfort people feel when dealing with issues of race and gender, and suggests ways to communicate more effectively. (color, 30 min., c1986)

You Make The Difference, Part 4. Deals with the necessity for entry-level employees to work well with people different from themselves. Dramas and interviews with workers explore the issues of sabotage, stereotypes, cultural differences, teamwork, and environments that promote productivity. (color, 25 min., c1990)

Supervising Differences, Part 5. Shows how first line supervisors, plant managers, and others can get the best out of their diverse workforce. Dramas and interviews help supervisors with climate setting, coaching and development, team building, supervising culturally diverse workers, controlling

stereotypes and assumptions, and dealing with employee conflict. (color, 30 min., c1990)

Champions of Diversity, Part 6. Senior executives show why they are "champions of diversity" and how they changed their own behavior and now lead their organizations in change. Special emphasis is given to personal growth changing demographics, and the benefits of diversity. (color, 28 min., c1990)

Profiles In Change, Part 7. A documentary about programs and processes of cultural change. Explores how organizations are changing to maximize their diverse human resources, focusing on recruitment, training, mentoring, team building, accommodating differences, communicating, rewarding, and holding managers accountable. (color, 58 min., c1990)

West Meets East in Japan. Pyramid Film and Video, Box 1048, Santa Monica, CA 90406; (800) 421-2304. This culture-specific video lets the viewer experience Japanese culture from the point of view of an outsider learning the norms of Japanese etiquette. A study guide is included.

Working Together: Managing Cultural Diversity. Crisp Publications, 95 First Street, Los Altos, CA 94022-9803; (800) 442-7477. This video-book program teaches how to work productively in a multicultural environment. Users learn how to manage their attitudes and communication in interactions with people from other cultures. The kit includes a leader's guide.

Note: The video information above was taken from the following publications:

Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (1993). *Managing diversity: A complete desk reference and planning guide* (pp. 422-423). Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

University of Minnesota. (1996). *University film and video: Diversity.* Minneapolis: Author.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. J. (1983). Organizational development in a multicultural environment. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 19*, 349-365.

Adler, N. J. (1991). *International dimensions of organizational behavior*. Boston: Kent.

Akabas, S. H., Gates, L. B., & Galvin, D. E. (1992). *Disability management: A complete system to reduce costs, increase productivity, meet employee needs and ensure legal compliance*. New York: AMACOM.

Alderfer, C. P. (1982). Problems of changing white males' behavior and beliefs concerning race relations. In P. S. Goodman (Ed.), *Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice* (pp. 122-165). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). (1996a). *ASTD buyer's guide & consultant directory*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

ASTD. (1996b, March). *National report on human resources*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Armitage, M. A. (1993, May). *Managing cultural diversity globally and domestically: A federal model for examining programs and competencies for leader effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Francisco.

Arredondo, P. (1996). *Successful diversity management initiatives: A blueprint for planning and implementation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Auster, E. R. (1988). Behind closed doors: Sex bias at professional and managerial levels. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 1*(2), 129-144.

Avery, R. D. (1979). *Fairness in selecting employees*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Balm, G. J. (1992). *Benchmarking: Practitioner's guide for becoming and staying best of the best*. Schaumburg, IL: QPMA Press.

Bantel, K. A., & Jackson, S. E. (1989). Top management and innovations in banking: Does the composition of the top team make a difference? *Strategic Management Journal, 10*, 107-124.

Baskerville, D. M., & Tucker, S. H. (1991). A blueprint for success. *Black Enterprise, 22*(4), 85-93.

Baytos, L. M. (1992). Learn how to manage differences. *HRMagazine, 12*, 34-37.

Baytos, L. M. (1995). *Designing and implementing successful diversity programs*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Beilinson, J. (1991). How one company invites workforce 2000 to its door. *Management Review* (Human Resources Forum Supplement), *5*(3), 1-3.

Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). *Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work*. Boston: Kent.

Black, H. C. (1990). *Black's law dictionary: Definitions of the terms and phrases of American and English jurisprudence, ancient and modern* (6th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishers Co.

Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. W., & Cameron, S. M. (1981). "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. *Research in Higher Education, 15*, 315-327.

Bloomfield, W. M. (1989). *Career beginnings: Helping disadvantaged youth achieve their potential*. Bloomington, IN: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Bolick, C., & Nestleroth, S. (1988). *Opportunity 2000: Creative affirmative action strategies for a changing workforce*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Bowers, A. G. (1984). Mentors and protégés in male-dominated corporate cultures: The experience of top-level women executives. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45*, 3103B.

Brewer, M. B., & Kramer, R. M. (1985). The psychology of intergroup attitudes and behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 36*, 219-243.

Brown, J. (1996). Sexual harassment: The last word. *Executive Report, 14*(11), 68.

Burack, E. H., & Mathys, N. J. (1987). *Human resource planning: A pragmatic approach to manpower staffing and development*. Lake Forest, IL: Brace-Park.

Carnevale, A. P., & Stone, S. C. (1994). Diversity beyond the golden rule. *Training & Development, 49*(10), 22-39.

Carnevale, A. P., & Stone, S. C. (1995). *The American mosaic*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carr, C. (1993). Diversity and performance: A shotgun marriage? *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 6*, 115-126.

Cascio, W. F. (1982). *Applied psychology in personnel management*. Reston, VA: Reston Publishing Company.

Casse, P. (1981). Assessing intercultural training effectiveness. In *Training for the cross-cultural mind: A handbook for cross-cultural trainers and consultants* (2nd ed.) (pp. 217-227). Washington, DC: The Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research.

Catalyst. (1990). *Women in corporate management: Results of a Catalyst Survey*. New York: Author.

Catalyst. (1993). *Successful initiatives for breaking the glass ceiling to upward mobility for minorities and women*. A Report on the Glass Ceiling Initiative for the U.S. Department of Labor. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Caudron, S. (1990). Monsanto responds to diversity. *Personnel Journal, 69*(11), 71-77.

Caudron, S. (1992). U.S. West finds strength in diversity. *Personnel Journal, 71*(3), 40-44.

Caudron, S. (1993). Training can damage diversity efforts: Ineffective programs can do more harm than good. *Personnel Journal, 72*(4), 50-61.

Chemers, M. M., Oskamp, S., & Constanzo, M. A. (Eds.). (1995). *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collins, E. G., & Blodgett, T. B. (1981). Sexual harassment . . . some see it . . . some won't. *Harvard Business Review, 59*(2), 76-94.

Collins, N. W. (1983). *Professional women and their mentors*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Copeland, L. (1988). Valuing workplace diversity. *Personnel Administrator, 33*(11), 38-40.

Cose, E. (1991, June 24). Are quotas really the problem? *Time, 26*, 70-71.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (1990). Problems with research by organizational scholars on issues of race and ethnicity. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 26*(1), 5-23.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Review, 5*(2), 34-47.

Cox, T. H., Jr. (1993). *Cultural diversity in organizations: Theory, research & practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Cox, T. H., Jr., & Blake, S. (1991). Managing cultural diversity: Implications for organizational competitiveness. *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(8), 45-56

Deutsch, C. H. (1991, December 8). Don't forget the white males. *The New York Times*, p. F29.

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 5-18.

Dickson, R. D. (1992). The business of equal opportunity. *Harvard Business Review, 70*(1), 46-53.

DiTomaso, N., Thompson, D. E., & Blake, D. H. (1988). Corporate perspectives on the advancement of minority managers. In D. E. Thompson & N. DiTomaso (Eds.), *Ensuring minority success in corporate management* (pp. 119-147). New York: Plenum.

Dumaine, B. (1990). Who needs a boss? *Fortune, 5*(9), 52-60.

Dunnette, M. D., & Motowidlo, S. K. (1982). Estimating benefits and costs of antisexist training programs in organizations. In H. J. Bernardin (Ed.), *Women in the workforce* (pp. 157-182). San Francisco: Prager.

Ehrlich, E., & Garland, S. (1988, September 19). For American business, a new world of workers. *Business Week, 5*, 24-30.

Elder, G. H., Jr. (1985). Age differentiation and the life course. *Annual Review of Sociology, 1*, 165-190.

Elfin, M., with Burke, S. (1993, April, 19). Race on campus: Segregation is growing, and black-white tensions are high. *U.S. News and World Report*, pp. 52-56.

Ellis, D. G., & Fisher, B. A. (1994). *Small group decision making: Communication and the group process* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Elshult, S., & Little, J. (1990). The case of valuing diversity. *HRMagazine, 35*(6), 50-55.

Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown.

Fernandez, J. P. (1988). Racism and sexism in corporate America: Still not color or gender blind in the 1980's. In D. E. Thompson & N. DiTomaso (Eds.), *Ensuring minority success in corporate management* (pp. 71-99). New York: Plenum.

Fernandez, J. P. (1991). *Managing a diverse workforce: Regaining the competitive edge*. New York: Lexington Books.

Fernandez, J. P. (1993). *The diversity advantage*. New York: Lexington Books.

Finney, M. (1989). Planning today for the future's changing shape. *Personnel Administrator, 34*(1), 44-45.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1984). *Social cognition*. New York: Random House.

Fitt, L. W., & Newton, D. A. (1989). When the mentor is a man and the protegee is a woman. *Harvard Business Review, 59*, 56-60.

Frey, J. H., & Eitzen, D. S. (1991). Sport and society. *Annual Review of Sociology, 17*, 503-522.

Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T., & Friedman, D. E. (1993). *The changing workforce: Highlights of the national study*. New York: Families and Work Institute.

Garcia, L. T., Erskine, N., Hawn, K., & Casmay, S. R. (1981). The effect of affirmative action on attributions of minority group members. *Journal of Personality, 49*, 427-437.

Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (1993). *Managing diversity: A complete desk reference and planning guide*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin

Gardenswartz, L., & Rowe, A. (1994). *Diverse teams at work: Capitalizing on the power of diversity*. Chicago: Irwin.

Gates, D. (1993, March 29). White male paranoia. *Newsweek, 6*, 46-54.

Geber, B. (1990). Managing diversity. *Training, 27*(7), 23-35.

Gibbs, N. (1991, October 21). Office crimes. *Time, 7*, 52-64.

Gleckman, H., Smart, T., Dwyer, P., Segal, T., & Weber, J. (1991, July 8). Race in the workplace: Is Affirmative Action working? *Business Week, 9*, 50-63.

Goldstein, I. L. (1991). Training in work organizations. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 83-117). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Goldstein, I. L., & Gilliam, P. (1990). Training system issues in the year 2000. *American Psychologist, 45*, 134-143.

Gottfredson, L. S. (1992). Dilemmas in developing diversity programs. In S. E. Jackson & Associates (Eds.), *Diversity in the workplace* (pp. 59-83). New York: Guilford Press.

Griggs, L. B. (1991). Ways to make diversity programs work. *HRMagazine, 36*(4), 37-41. (Interview with Bill Leonard)

Griggs, L. B. (1995). Valuing diversity: Where from . . . where to? In L. B. Griggs & L. L. Louw (Eds.), *Valuing diversity: New tools for a new reality* (pp. 1-14). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gunsch, D. (1993). Games augment diversity training. *Personnel Journal, 72*(6), 78-83.

Guttmann, A. (1988). *A whole new ball game: An interpretation of American sports*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Hamilton, S. F. (1990). *Apprenticeship for adulthood*. New York: The Free Press.

Hanover, J. M. (1993). *Impact of workforce diversity training: The role of the environment in transfer of training*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, DePaul University, Chicago, IL.

Harris, P., & Moran, R. T. (1991). *Managing cultural differences* (3rd ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.

Hayles, V. R. (1992). Valuing diversity in the food industry. *Food Engineering, 64*(4), 186.

Hayles, V. R. (1996). Diversity training and development. In R. L. Craig (Ed.), *The ASTD training and development handbook* (pp. 104-123). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hayles, V. R., & Russel, A. M. (1997). *The diversity directive: Why some initiatives fail & what to do about it*. Chicago: Irwin.

Heatley, K. B. (1992). *The relationship between sex-role orientation and career advancement barriers, attitudes, and same-gender biases toward women managers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.

Henderson, G. (1994a). *Cultural diversity in the workplace: Issues and strategies*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Henderson, G. (1994b). Traveling the path to diversity. *Security Management, 39*(7), 25-26.

Hoffman, L. R., Harburg, E., & Maier N. R. (1962). Differences and disagreements as factors in creative group problem solving. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64*, 206-214.

Hoffman, L. R., & Maier, N. R. (1961). Quality and acceptance of problem solutions by members of homogeneous groups and heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62*, 401-407.

Hopkins, W. E., Sterkel-Powell, K., & Hopkins, S. A. (1994). Training priorities for a diverse workforce. *Public Personnel Management, 23*, 429-435.

Hotelling, K. (1991). Sex harassment: A problem shielded by silence. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 497-501.

Howard, S. (1991). Organizational resources for addressing sexual harassment. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 507-511.

Hymowitz, C. (1989, February 16). One firm's bid to keep blacks, women. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. 5, 8.

Ihlanfeldt, K. R., & Sjoquist, D. L. (1993). Job accessibility and racial differences in youth employment rates. *The American Economic Review, 80*, 267-276.

Jackson, C. (1991). Preparing an organization to adopt and implement the concept of managing and valuing diversity. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 89-102). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Jackson, S. E. (1991, September 29). *Implications of workforce diversity for assessment practices*. Lecture given at the conference organized by Personnel Decisions, "Assessment: A Changing View," Minneapolis, MN.

Jackson, S. E. (1992). Preview of the road to be traveled. In S. E. Jackson & Associates, *Diversity in the workplace* (pp. 3-12). New York: Guilford Press.

Jackson, S. E., & Alvarez, E. B. (1992). Working through diversity as a strategic imperative. In S. E. Jackson & Associates, *Diversity in the workplace* (pp. 13-29). New York: Guilford Press.

Jackson, S. E., & Associates. (1992). *Diversity in the workplace* (The Professional Practice Series) (Douglas W. Bray, Ed., Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology). New York: Guilford Press.

Jamieson, D., & O'Mara, J. (1991). *Managing workforce 2000: Gaining the diversity advantage*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Jeruchim, J., & Shapiro, P. (1992). *Women, mentors, and success*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Johnson, S. J. (1995). *The status of valuing and managing diversity in Fortune 500 service organizations: Perceptions of top human resource professionals*. Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings, St. Louis, MO.

Johnston, W. B., & Packer, A. E. (1987). *Workforce 2000: Work and workers for the 21st century*. Indianapolis, IN: Hudson Institute.

Jones, J. (1982). *Prejudice and racism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Juni, S., Brannon, R., & Roth, M. M. (1988). Sexual and racial discrimination in service-seeking interactions: A field study in fast food and commercial establishments. *Psychological Reports, 63*(1), 71-76.

Karp, H. B., & Sutton, N. (1994). Why diversity programs miss the mark. *Human Resource Management News, 30*(7), 30-34.

Keller, J. M., Young, A., & Riley, M. (1996). *Evaluating diversity training: 17 ready-to-use tools*. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.

Kilborn, P. T. (1990, October 4). A company recasts itself to erase decades of bias. *The New York Times*, pp. A1, D21.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. Emeryville, CA: Publishers Group West.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Company.

Lamb, K. P. (1991). Assessing organizational readiness: Ready, willing, and able. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 47-65). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Lawlor, J. (1992, April, 24). Anti-bias efforts stir ire of many. *USA Today*, p. 1B.

Leach, J., George, B., Jackson, T., & LaBella, A. (1995). *A practical guide to working with diversity: The process, the tools, the resources*. New York: AMACOM.

Loden, M., & Rosener, J. B. (1991). *Workforce America! Managing employee diversity as a vital resource*. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.

Louw, L. L. (1995). No potential lost: The valuing diversity journey—an integrated approach to systemic change. In L. B. Griggs & L. L. Louw (Eds.), *Valuing diversity: New tools for a new reality* (pp. 15-58). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lublin, J. (1995, June 16). Focus shifts in diversity training in wake of high court decisions. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A5.

Lunding, F. J., Clements, G. L., & Perkins, D. S. (1978). Everyone who makes it has a mentor. *Harvard Business Review*, *56*, 89-101.

Mabry, M., Washington, F., Joseph, N., Koehl, C., Annin, P., & Manly, H. (1990, May 14). Past tokenism. *Newsweek*, *12*, 37-39.

Martin, L. G. (1995). *Race and ethnicity-related cultural diversity training programs: A typology*. Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings, St. Louis, MO.

McCormick, A. E., & Kinloch, G. C. (1986). Interracial contact in the customer-clerk situation. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *126*(4), 551-553.

McGrath, J. E. (1984). *Groups: Interaction and performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McLeod, P. L., & Lobel, S. A. (1992, August). The effects of ethnic diversity on idea generation in small groups. In J. L. Wall & L. R. Jauch (Eds.), *Academy of Management best papers proceedings* (pp. 227-231). Las Vegas: Academy of Management.

Melkonian, L. (1995). On the cutting edge of diversity: Visionary organizations are shaping a new model of multiculturalism in the workplace. *EEO Bimonthly, Equal Employment Opportunity Career Journal, 26*(1), 37.

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *The Academy of Management Review, 21*, 402-433.

Mobley, M., & Payne, T. (1992). Backlash! The challenge to diversity training. *Training and Development Journal, 46*(9), 45-52.

Morrison, A. M. (1992). *The new leaders: Guidelines on leadership diversity in America.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morrison, A. M., & Von Glinow, M. A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. *American Psychologist, 45*, 200-208.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). *Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Murrell, A., & Gaertner, S. (1992). Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 239-249.

Nelson-Horchler, J. (1991). The best man for the job is a man! *Industry Week, 240*, 50-52.

Nelton, S. (1988, July). Meet your new workforce. *Nation's Business, 45*(9), 2-7.

Nelton, S. (1995). Nurturing diversity: Enterprise 2000. *Nation's Business, 83*(6), 25-27.

Offermann, L. R., & Gowing, M. K. (1990). Organizations of the future: Changes and challenges. *American Psychologist, 45*, 95-108.

O'Hare, W. P. (1993). Diversity trend: More minorities looking less alike. *Population Today, 21*(4), 1-2.

Ohlott, P. J., Ruderman, M. N., & McCauley, C. D. (1991). *Gender differences in managerial job demands and learning*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Pedersen, P. (1994). Developing multicultural awareness, knowledge and skill. In *A handbook for developing multicultural awareness* (pp. 35-36). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Petrini, C. (1989). How do you manage a diverse workforce? *Training and Development Journal, 42*, 13-20.

Pollar, O., & González, R. (1994). *Dynamics of diversity: Strategic programs for your organization*. Menlo Park, CA: Crisp Publications.

Poole, P. J. (1997). *Diversity: A business advantage. A practical guide*. Ontario: Poole Publishing Company.

Population Reference Bureau Integrated. (1997). *World population data sheet of population reference bureau*. Washington, DC: Author.

Purnell, J. H., & Tervalon, A. (1991). Valuing differences: The Springfield experience. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 104-128). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Rhodes, S. R. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behavior: A review and conceptual analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 93*, 328-367.

Robinson, J. W. (1991). Updating and optimizing Adam Smith. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 154-178). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Roche, G. (1979). Much ado about mentors. *Harvard Business Review*, *57*(1), 14-28.

Rogers, T. D. (1997). Of prejudice and pride. In L. L. Naylor (Ed.). *Cultural diversity in the United States* (pp. 229-243). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rosener, J. B. (1986, December 7). Coping with sexual static. *The New York Times Magazine*, *62*, 89.

Rossett, A., & Bickham, T. (1994). Diversity training: Hope, faith and cynicism. *Training*, *31*(1), 41-46.

Rossman, M. L. (1994). *Multicultural marketing: Selling to a diverse America*. New York: AMACOM.

Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(2), 247-270.

Sabur, S. A. (1991). Valuing differences as a business issue. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 189-199). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Sanders, V. (1991). Managing diversity: A developing part of 3M's culture. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 135-152). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Sandroff, R. (1988). Sexual harassment in fortune 500. *Working Woman*, *13*(12), 69-73.

Savoie, E. J. (1991). Working with diversity at Ford. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 205-222). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Schmidt, P. (1988, October 16). Women and minorities: Is industry ready? *The New York Times*, pp. 25, 27.

Schwartz, F. (1989). Management women and the new facts of life. *Harvard Business Review, 67*, 65-76.

Sessa, V. I., Jackson, S. E., & Rapini, D. T. (1995). Work force diversity: The good, the bad, and the reality. In G. R. Ferris, R. D. Rosen, & D. T. Barnum (Eds.), *Handbook of human resource management* (pp. 263-281). Cambridge, MA: Backwell Publishers.

Sigall, H., & Page, R. (1971). Current stereotypes: A little fading, a little faking. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18*, 247-255.

Sims, S. J., & Sims, R. R. (1993). Diversity and difference training in the United States. In R. R. Sims & R. F. Dennehy (Eds.), *Diversity and differences in organizations: An agenda for answers and questions* (pp. 73-92). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Simons, G. F. (Ed.). (1992). *The questions of diversity: Assessment tools for organizations and individuals* (4th ed.). Amherst, MA: ODT Incorporated.

Simons, G. F., Vasquez, C., & Harris, P. R. (1993). *Transcultural leadership: Empowering the diverse workforce*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.

Smith, A., & Stewart, A. J. (1983). Approaches to studying racism and sexism in black women's lives. *Journal of Social Issues, 39*, 1-15.

Smith, T. W. (1990). *Ethnic images* (National Opinion Research Center, GSS Topical Report No. 19). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Society for Human Resource Management and the Commerce Clearing House (SHRM/CCH). (1993). *SHRM/CCH survey: Ideas and trends in personnel* (Part II Report). Chicago: Commerce Clearing House.

Stead, B. A., & Zinkhan, G. M. (1986). Service priority in department stores: The effects of customer gender and dress. *Sex Roles, 15*(11/12), 601-611.

Steiner, I. D. (1972). *Group process and productivity*. New York: Academic Press.

Stewart, S. (1996). Working with gay persons. In N. Carr-Ruffino (Ed.), *Managing diversity: People skills for a multicultural workplace* (pp. 107-138). Cincinnati, OH: Thompson Executive Press.

Stewart, T. A. (1991, December 16). Gay in corporate America. *Fortune*, pp. 42-56.

Stoner, C. R., & Hartman, R. I. (1990). Family responsibilities and career progress: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Business Horizons, 33*, 7-14.

Summers, R. J. (1991). The influence of Affirmative Action on perceptions of a beneficiary's qualifications. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 1265-1276.

Sutton, C., & Moore, K. (1985). Executive women—20 years later. *Harvard Business Review, 63*(5), 42-66.

Tang, T., & McCollum, S. (1996). Sexual harassment in the workplace. *Public Personnel Management, 25*(1), 53-58.

Thacker, R. A., & Gohmann, S. (1996). Emotional and psychological consequences of sexual harassment: A descriptive study. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied, 130*(7), 429-446.

Thiederman, S. (1991). *Bridging cultural barriers for corporate success*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(2), 107-117.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1991). *Beyond race and gender: Unleashing the power of your total workforce by managing diversity*. New York: AMACOM.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1992). Managing diversity: A conceptual framework. In S. E. Jackson & Associates (Eds.), *Diversity in the workplace* (pp. 306-317). New York: Guilford Press.

Thomas, R. R., Jr. (1996). *Redefining diversity*. New York: AMACOM.

Thomas, D. A., & Alderfer, C. P. (1989). The influence of race on career dynamics: Theory and research on minority career experience. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 133-158). New York: Cambridge.

Tilove, J. (1991, July 22). Business discovers diversity. *The Anchorage Times*, pp. 5, 12.

Tomberlin, M. (1996). Sexual harassment is not dead issue in metro area. *Birmingham Business Journal*, *13*(28), 2-3.

Tomervik, K. (1994). *Workforce diversity in Fortune 500 corporations headquartered in Minnesota: Concepts and practices*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

Tomervik, K. (1995). *Workforce diversity in Fortune 500 corporations headquartered in Minnesota: Concepts and practices*. Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings, St. Louis, MO.

Towers Perrin. (1991). *Workforce 2000 today: Workforce change—A bottom-line concern*. New York: Author.

Towers Perrin & Hudson Institute. (1990). *Workforce 2000: Competing in a seller's market: Is corporate America prepared?* Valhalla, NY: Towers Perrin.

Triandis, H. C. (1976). *Variations in black and white perceptions of the social environment*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Triandis, H. C., & Bhawuk, D. P. (1994). *Bridging the gap between theory and practice: A comparative study of current diversity programs* (Final Report, Working Paper #2). Champaign: University of Illinois Center for Human Resource Management.

Triandis, H. C., Hall, E. R., & Ewen, R. B. (1965). Member heterogeneity and dyadic creativity. *Human Relations, 18*, 33-55.

Triandis, H. C., Kurowski, L. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (1994). Workplace diversity. In H. C. Triandis, M. Dunnette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 770-827). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 549-579.

University of Maryland Diversity Database. (1996). *Diversity dictionary*. Internet: http://www.inform.umd.edu:8080/EdRes/Topic/Diversity/Reference/divdic.html

University of Minnesota. (1996). *University film and video: Diversity*. Minneapolis: Author.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1994). *Statistical abstracts of the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1993). *Statistical report on employment*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Commerce & U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1993). *Profiles of America's elderly: Growth of America's elderly*. Washington, DC: Authors.

U.S. Department of Labor. (1992). *Pipelines of progress: A status report on the glass ceiling*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Velsor, E., & Hughes, M. W. (1990). *Gender differences in the development of managers: How women managers learn from experience*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Vital statistics: 1995 industry report. (1996). *Training*, *32*(10), 55-66.

Walker, B. A. (1991). Valuing differences: The concept and a model. In M. A. Smith & S. J. Johnson (Eds.), *Valuing differences in the workplace* (pp. 23-44). Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.

Washington, C. (1995). *A theory of diversity*. Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings, St. Louis, MO.

Watson W. E., Kumar K., & Michaelsen, L. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*, 590-602.

Wentling, R. M. (1992). Women in middle management: Their career development and aspirations. *Business Horizons*, *35*, 47-54.

Wexley, K. N., & Nemeroff, W. F. (1974). The effects of racial prejudice, race of applicant, and biographical similarity on interviewer evaluation of job applicants. *Journal of Social and Behavioral Science*, *20*, 66-78.

Wheeler, M. L. (1994). *Diversity training* (Research Report Number 1083-94RR). New York: The Conference Board.

Wheeler, M. L. (1995). *Diversity: Business rationale and strategies* (Research Report Number 1030-95RR). New York: The Conference Board.

Wilder, D. A. (1986). Social categorization: Implications for creation and reduction of intergroup bias. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *19*, 291-355.

Willems, E. P., & Clark III, R. D. (1977). Shift toward risk and heterogeneity of groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *7*, 304-312.

Winterle, M. (1992). *Workforce diversity: Corporate challenges, corporate responses* (Research Report Number 1013-92RR). New York: The Conference Board.

Work, J. W. (1993). *What every CEO already knows about managing diversity*. Highland City, FL: Rainbow Books.